

JPRS 69079

11 May 1977

TRANSLATIONS FROM KOMMUNIST
No. 5, MARCH 1977

DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT A
Approved for Public Release
Distribution Unlimited

20000215 100

U. S. JOINT PUBLICATIONS RESEARCH SERVICE

REPRODUCED BY
NATIONAL TECHNICAL
INFORMATION SERVICE
U. S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
SPRINGFIELD, VA. 22161

Reproduced From
Best Available Copy

NOTE

JPRS publications contain information primarily from foreign newspapers, periodicals and books, but also from news agency transmissions and broadcasts. Materials from foreign-language sources are translated; those from English-language sources are transcribed or reprinted, with the original phrasing and other characteristics retained.

Headlines, editorial reports, and material enclosed in brackets [] are supplied by JPRS. Processing indicators such as [Text] or [Excerpt] in the first line of each item, or following the last line of a brief, indicate how the original information was processed. Where no processing indicator is given, the information was summarized or extracted.

Unfamiliar names rendered phonetically or transliterated are enclosed in parentheses. Words or names preceded by a question mark and enclosed in parentheses were not clear in the original but have been supplied as appropriate in context. Other unattributed parenthetical notes within the body of an item originate with the source. Times within items are as given by source.

The contents of this publication in no way represent the policies, views or attitudes of the U.S. Government.

PROCUREMENT OF PUBLICATIONS

JPRS publications may be ordered from the National Technical Information Service, Springfield, Virginia 22151. In ordering, it is recommended that the JPRS number, title, date and author, if applicable, of publication be cited.

Current JPRS publications are announced in Government Reports Announcements issued semi-monthly by the National Technical Information Service, and are listed in the Monthly Catalog of U.S. Government Publications issued by the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402.

Indexes to this report (by keyword, author, personal names, title and series) are available through Bell & Howell, Old Mansfield Road, Wooster, Ohio, 44691.

Correspondence pertaining to matters other than procurement may be addressed to Joint Publications Research Service, 1000 North Glebe Road, Arlington, Virginia 22201.

BIBLIOGRAPHIC DATA SHEET	1. Report No. JPRS 69079	2.	3. Recipient's Accession No.
4. Title and Subtitle TRANSLATIONS FROM KOMMUNIST No. 5, March 1977		5. Report Date 11 May 1977	
7. Author(s)		6.	
9. Performing Organization Name and Address Joint Publications Research Service 1000 North Glebe Road Arlington, Virginia 22201		8. Performing Organization Repr. No.	
		10. Project/Task/Work Unit No.	
		11. Contract/Grant No.	
12. Sponsoring Organization Name and Address As above		13. Type of Report & Period Covered	
		14.	
15. Supplementary Notes Translations from KOMMUNIST, theoretical journal of the CPSU Central Committee, Moscow, published 18 times a year.			
16. Abstracts The report contains articles on political, economic, military and social developments and problems within the USSR and as they relate to communist and other countries.			
17. Key Words and Document Analysis. 17a. Descriptors USSR Political Science Sociology Propaganda Economics			
17b. Identifiers/Open-Ended Terms			
17c. COSATI Field/Group 5D, 5K, 5C			
18. Availability Statement Unlimited Availability Sold by NTIS Springfield, Virginia 22151		19. Security Class (This Report) UNCLASSIFIED	21. No. of Pages 162
		20. Security Class (This Page) UNCLASSIFIED	PC 1108

11 May 1977

TRANSLATIONS FROM KOMMUNIST

No. 5, March 1977

Translations from the Russian-language theoretical organ of the CPSU Central Committee published in Moscow (18 issues per year). Where certain articles, reprinted from other Russian-language sources, are not translated, indication of this fact is made in the table of contents.

CONTENTS	PAGE
Soviet Trade Unions - An Influential Force in Our Society (L. I. Brezhnev)	1
Law of Gradual Rapprochement Among Socialist Countries (B. Ladygin, Yu. Pekshev).....	20
Party Concern for Quality (T. Arkhipova).....	34
Brigade Contracting in Machine Building (L. Poklonskiy).....	45
Democracy of the Great October Revolution; Some Historical Facts and Their Falsification (K. Zarodov).....	56
Three Centuries of Immortality (I. Vasil'yev, L. Naumenko).....	72
Wings of Creativity (V. Litvinov).....	86
The Final Act and the Struggle for Detente (Yu. Vladimirov, V. Osyanin).....	101
Development of the Class Structure of Bourgeois Society (Joseph Sleifstein).....	114
Eternal Sin of British Imperialism (V. Ovchinnikov).....	138

CONTENTS (Continued)	Page
Comprehensive Study of the Developed Socialist Economy (Ye. Kapustin).....	148
Contemporary Capitalism and Ideological Struggle (G. Khromushin).....	151

PUBLICATION DATA

English title of journal : TRANSLATIONS FROM KOMMUNIST,
No 5, March 1977

Russian title of journal : KOMMUNIST

Editor (s) : R. I. Kosolapov

Publishing House : Izdatel'stvo PRAVDA

Signed to press : 24 Mar 77

Copies : 984,000

COPYRIGHT : Izdatel'stvo PRAVDA, KOMMUNIST,
Moscow, 1977

SOVIET TRADE UNIONS - AN INFLUENTIAL FORCE IN OUR SOCIETY

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 5, Mar 77, pp 3-19 LD

[Speech by L. I. Brezhnev at the 16th USSR Trade Unions Congress]

[Text] Dear comrades,

Esteemed guests,

I have been entrusted with an honorable and at the same time pleasant mission of extending to the delegates of the 16th congress of trade unions warm, cordial greetings from the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, the Political Bureau and the secretariat of the CPSU CC.

From shops and mines, from construction sites, fields and farms, from scientific laboratories and educational establishments, from state institutions and creative organisations, from all republics and regions of our multinational homeland, the envoys of the great labour army have brought their thoughts and experience here, to this hall.

Present here are representatives of the heroic working class whose work lies at the basis of the might and prosperity of our country and whose ideology--Marxism-Leninism--serves us as a lode star in our advance toward the summits of social progress.

Present here are representatives of the multimillioned army of workers in agriculture whose irreplaceable contribution to strengthening the economy and improving the life of the Soviet people is highly valued by all of our party and our entire people.

The party attaches great importance to the fact that collective farmers are increasingly drawn into the trade union movement. "To strengthen the work of the trade unions," V. I. Lenin said, "we must extend them not only to the rural proletariat, but to all the working peasantry." This behest by V. I. Lenin is being consistently carried into life.

Among the congress delegates are many workers in science, technology, culture and art, people who are playing an outstanding part in enhancing the intellectual and cultural potential of the country.

Also represented here is a large section of the working people to whom we refer collectively as employees and whose work is needed in any sphere of public life.

It is with special warmth that I should like to say a few words about the women trade union activists present here who represent more than fifty million working women. I must say straightforwardly that, we, men, are indebted to them. We have done far from everything to ease the double burden they are bearing both at home and in production. There are more grounds, therefore, for us to address words of gratitude to our mothers, wives and sisters, to thank them for their selfless work.

There are many young people in this hall. And this is as it should be. Young people are the morrow of our country, they are a generation who will take over the reins of society in no distant future. But there is no cause for concern: We have a good, dependable replacement.

Thus, comrades, all the principal social groups, all the creative, constructive forces of Soviet society are represented most fully and in all their diversity at this congress. Such a widely representative congress is a vivid manifestation of democracy, our socialist democracy which is deeply rooted in the people's life.

The creation of mature, developed socialism has posed in a new way many problems of the economic, socio-political and cultural development of the country. Both our opportunities and social requirements have changed. Many aspects of the practical work of the party and the people are undergoing profound changes. What I have in mind is matters of great magnitude and complexity, matters of vital importance both for the whole of society and for every person in the Soviet Union, for every Soviet family. It is to such matters and such accomplishments that the decisions of the 24th and 25th congresses of the party and the strategy they worked out for communist construction--the strategy of victorious advance--orient us.

The present stage of the Soviet Union's development places great responsibility on all of us and makes everyone of us set higher standards for himself and for his work in order to make a fitting contribution to solving the tasks set by the party. This fully applies to the trade unions, too.

We are greatly satisfied to say that from the first days of their existence the trade unions of our country have been marching hand-in-hand with the party. Determining the place and role of the trade unions in socialist society V. I. Lenin referred to them as a school of administration, a school of economic management, a school of communism. Have these aspects of trade union work been exhausted in the conditions of developed socialism? No, they have not. On the contrary, they assume still greater importance in these conditions and reveal themselves more fully.

The Soviet trade unions have been and remain a school of administration. And what is especially important, indeed a matter of basic importance, is that they represent a mass school where tens of millions of people learn the art of managing production and running the state and society.

The Soviet trade unions have been and remain a school of economic management. And it is also a matter of basic importance that they are a school of socialist economic management. In our society, production and the working man are not opposed to each other. The two-fold task of the trade unions is to show concern for the development of the national economy, for increasing production, concern for the rights and interests of the working people and their working and living conditions. This is indeed a two-fold task since the growth and qualitative improvement of the economy is the direct and sure way to improving the living conditions of the working man, his family and all citizens.

The Soviet trade unions have been and remain a school of communism in which people learn to live and work in communist style. A new type of working man is molded in this school. It cultivates the lofty qualities of workers-internationalists. It cultivates loyalty to the unfading slogan "Workers of all countries, unite."

As time goes on and the situation changes, ever new problems arise but the road indicated by Lenin remains the only true and correct one.

Comrades, I would not like to run ahead of the discussion which is to ensue at your congress. But speaking on behalf and on the instruction of the party Central Committee I should like to voice some considerations concerning things that deserve to be given special attention by the trade unions and the tasks to the solution of which they should make an especially great contribution.

Let's begin with the economy. What is characteristic of the current period? It is evidently characterized by the fact that in the centre of economic policy today is the struggle for raising the efficiency of social production, for improving the quality of work in all fields and in all sections of the national economy.

Efficiency and quality are the key problem of the Tenth Five-Year Plan. But care should be taken to prevent this laconic and precise formula from becoming a wornout phrase, from losing its active and mobilizing character. One should ask himself daily whether he is doing everything he can for translating it into life. There is a lot the trade unions can do in this respect, there is a fair field for activity before them.

The increased scale and complexity of our national economy have posed the problem of improving economic planning and management, improving the entire economic mechanism. A great amount of work is being done in this field. Central planning and economic bodies are preparing specific proposals. There must be no delay in this work, it is regarded as very important by the party, but there are other things which we never forget. In addition to good management "from above" socialism has one more powerful force for speeding up economic growth. These are creative activity, initiative and labour enthusiasm of millions that come "from below", or to be more exact, from the depth of society.

Therein lies the great advantage of socialism. Therein lies one of its main "secrets" which have enabled us, in the course of our history, to achieve what appeared impossible and to amaze the whole world by the high growth rates of the new society and by its vital force and dynamism.

This factor will be no less important for us in the future, too. Experience constantly brings forth new forms of mass initiative. Here a great deal depends on you, comrades, on the work of the trade unions, on their ability to support a creative initiative, to use it for solving concrete pressing problems at each enterprise, at each sector of work.

The first thing that comes to my mind in this context is the role of the trade unions in developing the socialist emulation movement. It would be recalled that way back in 1920, the ninth congress of the party instructed the trade unions to organize socialist emulation. This major responsibility rests with them to this day.

It is quite natural that the socialist emulation acquires qualitatively new features, new specifics at the present stage. This emulation is inseparable from the scientific and technological revolution today. It increasingly centers around the problems of efficiency and quality. It is aimed at achieving the best final results in the national economy. It is closely linked with counter plans in which the initiative and selfless work of millions finds such striking expression.

It is not only the front-rankers, the winners, but also those lagging behind that are identified in the course of the socialist emulation movement. Such a movement helps us in this way to concentrate our efforts on rectifying shortcomings, on improving the performance of lagging sections in order to speed up general progress.

All this makes the organization of emulation a complex thing which must not follow beaten paths. All this sets great tasks before the trade unions, enhances their role in economic management and in organizational mass political work.

The rising level of socialist emulation places great obligations not only on the trade unions but also on economic executives and factory management. The enthusiasm of the masses must not be abused. Good initiatives need not only praise but also constant practical support. Not a single useful initiative must be allowed to dwindle away. This is how the party poses this question.

Such an approach, while ensuring a greater economic effect of the socialist emulation movement, enhances its educational value and this is something one must not forget. There is nothing like socialist emulation to educate a new man and to help his political growth and his moral improvement.

The clear-cut political objective of such socialist emulation is manifested most strikingly in the movement for a communist attitude to work. This move-

ment involves tens of millions of peoples. But the emphasis here is not on quantity but on quality. Therefore in conferring the lofty titles of communist labour teams and communist labour shock workers one should always be guided by V. I. Lenin's injunction that "this very honourable title must be won by prolonged and persistent effort, by practical achievement in genuine communist development."

Just think over these words, comrades. They formulate a political, party approach to this matter. They raise a good barrier to formalism, red tape, eyewash and all those things which we, communists, must combat most vigorously, I repeat, most vigorously.

There is one more aspect of work in which the trade unions have a very important part to play. This is strengthening labour discipline.

The Soviet citizen is the master of his own country. He is the sole architect of the might and wealth of his society. No one except the people in this country can use the results of social labour, but we have no one to work for us. This means that everyone should work in such a way as not to be ashamed of himself and to be able to look in the eyes of his comrades with a clear conscience.

It is quite natural therefore that front-ranking workers, veteran workers, and whole labour collectives point to the need for greater exactingness toward those who forget about the dignity of a working man, who break discipline and who do not take care of public property. It is your direct duty, comrades, the duty of all trade union organizations to support in every way the voices of these honest working people.

What gives urgency to this question is not that discipline has grown worse. This is not so, on the whole. But we cannot overlook the new demands that are made on us by new technology and techniques, but the growing interdependence of branches and industries, by the entire modern aspect of our economy.

The damage caused by every violation, every disruption of labour planning and technological discipline increases enormously today. Indeed, there can be no comparison between losses from poor performance by a navy whose only equipment was a spade and a wheelbarrow and losses from the idleness of a walking excavator. Malfunctioning of one shop may cause losses to the plant measured by thousands of roubles and in the final count may affect the performance of a whole branch.

And how important today is the economy of working time! Here are some figures which give an idea of the price of one minute on a national scale. Every minute, this country produces over two million kilowatt-hours of electricity, almost 300 tons of steel, over a thousand tons of oil, almost 1,500 tons of coal, and 650,000 cubic metres of gas. The loss of one minute of working time on a national scale is tantamount to the loss of the results of one day's work of two hundred thousand people.

Such is the price of one working minute. Unfortunately we sometimes forget about this. Otherwise losses from absenteeism and idle periods would not be measured by millions of man-days. I do not wish to spoil the mood of those present here but still I feel compelled to say that the trade union organizations are not fighting vigorously enough against working time losses.

The party regards the trade unions as a great force capable of giving real help in strengthening labour discipline in all sectors of production, moreover, in strengthening it by means and methods that are characteristic of our socialist system, namely by cultivating responsibility and conscious discipline, by using a thought-out system of material and moral incentives, comradely criticism and self-criticism and by every-day influence exerted on the individual by a labour collective.

Comrades, speaking of economic problems I cannot but touch upon some of the pressing problems relating to the development of agriculture. More appropriately so since never before have the farmers been represented so widely at a trade union congress as this time.

We have set a great task, that of ensuring an uninterrupted supply of the population with quality and varied foodstuffs. Of special importance in this respect is the problem of increasing the output of meat and meat products and hence of further developing stock-breeding. No doubt, we shall solve this problem. The point is, however, to solve it as soon as possible. This is the task to which all those employed in agriculture should fully apply themselves.

Our aim is to switch livestock-breeding to an industrial basis, in the first place by interfarm cooperation, specialization and concentration. We have already achieved some progress moving along that road.

At the same time it is impossible not to see that putting livestock-breeding and fodder production on an industrial basis would take considerable time.

Mindful of this, the Central Committee has repeatedly warned against excesses, and undue haste so that in pinning hopes on large-scale farms the state and collective farms should not be prematurely dismantled. Unfortunately this advice was not heeded everywhere. This is the only explanation for the alarming fact that in recent years a considerable number of collective and state farms have discontinued breeding pigs and poultry. Considering that steady supply of meat for the population is yet to be achieved, this situation cannot be tolerated and should be rectified. All the more so, since in the future, too, collective and state farms should not abandon livestock farming, where it is economically justified.

Mention should be made of another reserve of no small importance. The basis for forming state reserve stocks of food is undoubtedly public production. But simultaneously it is important to fully tap the possibilities of private subsidiary plots.

The local bodies, the collective and state farms are called upon to contribute to this work and consumer cooperatives, too, could be of serious help. In particular, there is a lot to be said for investing them with greater responsibility for marketing surplus of farm produce from the private plots and collective farms.

The growing needs of livestock-breeding necessitate a new approach to some other questions. We have correctly considered and consider grain production to be the cornerstone of agricultural development. To meet the food needs of the population, we have enough grain but we are now concerned with another, no less important aspect of the grain problem, i.e. increasing the output of the more valuable fodder grain crops, and improving their quality. It is also important to expand irrigated grasslands and pasturage and the crops of alfalfa.

Steady supply of food for the population, further demands a serious effort to improve transportation, storage and processing of agricultural produce. The solution of these tasks should be aided by improvements in the management of all the food in the country. We must expedite the preparation of proposals on that important issue.

Our congress, comrades, is meeting at a very crucial time for agriculture, when fieldwork is getting underway. I take this opportunity to wish great successes in the sowing campaign to the collective farmers and state farm workers.

Comrades! The party has assigned top-priority to raising the material and cultural standards of the Soviet people. It is translating into thousands upon thousands of practical deeds our program slogan: "Everything for the benefit of man, everything for the sake of man!"

We know how much is being done in that area. In the past few months alone a number of important decisions have been taken. One of them envisages higher earnings for more than 30 million Soviet people, another is concerned with expanding the manufacture of consumer goods and improvement of their quality. Work in all these directions will continue. There is no doubt that the trade unions will make a tangible contribution to the solution of the tasks involved in improving the living standards of the people.

This puts a high premium on constant concern for improving labour conditions, minimizing manual, low-skilled and physically arduous labour and working to eliminate occupational diseases and occupational injuries.

The party regards technical retooling of industry, agriculture, construction and transport, for which vast sums are allocated, as the decisive means of improving the labour conditions and making all production safe and convenient to work in. Our aim can be formulated as follows: From safety rules to safe technology. We have embarked on that road and will undeviatingly pursue it.

However, while having a good grasp of the perspective, we should also see what surrounds us today. Can it be said that the situation as regards labour conditions is satisfactory?? Unfortunately not. It sometimes happens that the

management and the trade unions blink serious drawbacks; [as received] regard measures to improve labour conditions and safety as something secondary and tolerate facts of neglect in meeting the obligations written down in collective agreements.

Early this year a decree was adopted, on the proposal of the AUCCTU, on further improvement of labour protection and safety regulations in the national economy. But the initiative of the trade unions should not end there. What has been planned must be carried through. This is a strict demand to all the ministries and departments, and all economic managers. It is also one of the key tasks of the trade unions.

Much remains to be done to improve public catering and everyday services in industries. In these matters, as indeed, in all the other matters affecting the interests of the man at work, the trade union committees should be more demanding and aggressive.

Concern for man does not, of course, end and cannot end at the factory gate. A vast area of our social policy is linked with improving the everyday living conditions of the Soviet people, concern for their health and leisure, in order that the working people and their families can dispose of their free time in a reasonable way that would benefit them and society. Technical creativity, physical culture and sports and amateur art activities--all these are a need of millions. This offers great opportunities and a vast field of activity for the trade unions.

I think it necessary to emphasize that not only party organizations but also the trade unions cannot afford to take a passive stand, which results in considerable allocations for the construction of housing, childcare institutions, schools, hospitals, clubs and stadiums not being fully used in a number of republics, territories and regions year-in and year-out.

To be concerned for man does not only mean meeting his material requirements. Addressing the delegates to the congress, I would like to single out the moral and ethical aspects. That does not call for special outlays. What is indispensable, however, is universal and daily consideration and sympathy for man.

How is one to contribute to a happy retirement? How to alleviate the lot of an invalid? How to heal a real or imagined insult? Such questions constantly crop up. They can only be answered by constantly perfecting the lofty art of careful attitude towards man. Who else but the trade unions, which are in the very thick of life, should take part in that important business on which depend the destinies and happiness of all the Soviet people.

Comrades! The party attaches prime significance to promoting democratic principles in production. The working man in socialist society is not a mechanical executor of certain operations or instructions. He is concerned not only with the immediate result of his personal efforts but with their place and significance in the overall labour process. The desire and opportunity to make a personal contribution to the common cause is a tremendous

stimulus to work which is conducive to large-scale thinking proceeding from nationwide considerations and identification with the common concerns.

When the working man knows that his voice is being heeded and his attitude taken into account in the development of social and economic plans, then and only then does he feel a genuine master of production and master of his destiny. Thus political and production tasks merge.

What is being done by the trade unions in involving more and more working people in the management of production, is only one manifestation of socialist democracy. Being an influential social force, the trade unions play an important role in our entire political system and in promoting socialist democracy. The pivotal thing for us there has been and will always be what is literally expressed in the word democracy, namely, rule of the people, that is, participation of the masses in running government and social affairs, "genuine self-government by the people" of which Lenin spoke.

Socialism and democracy are inseparable. In building communism, we will develop democracy. One speaks, of course, about socialist democracy, that is, a democracy that covers the political, social and economic spheres, a democracy that, above all, ensure social justice and social equality.

Comrades! Our country now has almost 700,000 local trade union organizations, about half a million workshop union committees and two and a half million trade unions groups. This a powerful force, a force which is in the frontline of the struggle to fulfill the five-year plans, to improve the effectiveness of production and all its qualitative performance indicators. This force is active in all the labour collectives, i.e. precisely where the notions of high politics and economics are being translated into the practical language and where the people's attitude towards life and society is moulded to a large extent.

For the collective in which one works is a home, family and school all in one. It is here that professional skills, experience and a conscientious attitude towards work are passed on from generation to generation and communist dedication and loyalty to party, readiness always to be in the front ranks in the most difficult and crucial sections is being passed from heart to heart to the youth.

It is impossible to imagine a working collective without a trade union group, a local trade union committee or factory committee. Millions of trade union activists, energetic people of initiative, are voluntarily and selflessly bringing kindness, solicitude and help to every worker and his family. Let this arduous but exceedingly useful work of the community activists always meet with understanding and appreciation.

One more remark, comrades. I think that the party's course for effectiveness and quality has a direct bearing on the style of all our social, including trade union, work. It is not the number of measures that one should be after. Let us ask ourselves, do we not have meetings too often and lasting too long?

Do not we produce too many different papers--instructions, decisions and rulings--while sometimes forgetting to see that these papers make a difference in practical life. It is not the number of papers, nor the number and length of meetings but their political thrust, effectiveness and practical results--these are the criteria by which social work can and must be measured.

Comrades! The Soviet trade unions have at their disposal a solid material basis and vast financial resources.

At present, in accordance with the decisions of the 25th congress of the party, a serious change is underway of the structure of the trade unions in production, the improvement of the forms and methods of their activity. That will, undoubtedly, have a positive effect on the work of the trade unions.

The trade unions have a rich arsenal of forms and means to exercise their rights--workers' meetings, standing production conferences and collective agreements. They have the right of legislative initiative. It is important to make more extensive and effective use of these rights.

I assure you, comrades, that all the just demands of the trade unions to economic managers and the administration will get unqualified support of the party.

Comrades, delegates, our time is a time of the steady growth of the world-historic role of the man of labour. Everywhere working people are marching in the vanguard of the struggle for peace and international security, for national liberation and social progress. They are taking into their hands the destinies of civilization. These are reliable, strong hands!

At the latest congresses our party assessed the general direction of the changes now taking place in the workers' and trade union movement. We proceeded and continue to proceed from the premise that the working class movement is becoming an increasingly important factor of social progress. But also growing constantly is its responsibility to history. Hence the need to further strengthen the unity of the worldwide army of labour, unity in the struggle for social progress, in the struggle for peace and security of peoples.

The 16th trade union congress, attended by delegations from all over the world, is a wonderful demonstration of the vitality of the slogan of proletarian solidarity, testimony to the fact that its significance is realized well in various countries. May I extend ardent greetings to all foreign guests!

We are convinced that favourable conditions are shaping up now for developing cooperation between various trends in the workers' movement both on the national and the international scale. Contacts between trade unions of a different orientation are also becoming ever more regular and their interaction with other public forces is also growing.

We welcome all steps facilitating the search of common positions and the development of cooperation between the major international trade union centres--the World Federation of Trade Unions, the International Confederation of Free Trade Unions and the World Confederation of Labour.

Although the attainment of unity of the international trade union movement is a lengthy and complex process, we are convinced that this will be an ongoing process. In any case, Soviet trade unions have worked and will work with precisely this perspective in mind.

Turning to foreign policy matters, I want to stress that the entire work by our party and the Soviet state in the international field, an extensive and intensive work, was determined and is determined by the program of further struggle for peace and international cooperation adopted by the 25th congress. This program, of course, is intended to span a period of more than a year. But even within one year much has already been accomplished.

This applies, first of all, to the strengthening of the unity of the fraternal socialist states, the deepening of their allaround cooperation.

Ties and contacts between the leadership of socialist countries are becoming ever more intensive. In the time since the 25th CPSU Congress the leaders of fraternal parties have met collectively three times--in Berlin, Bucharest and Moscow, not to mention the discussions in the Crimea. The regular, already fourth meeting of secretaries of central committees for international and ideological questions was just held in Sofia. A conference of secretaries of central committees for organization-party work and the first meeting of the committee of foreign ministers of Warsaw Treaty countries, will be held.

Thinking about the future in the now distant from us year of 1914 in a world engulfed by the imperialist war, split by hostility and hatred, Vladimir Ilich Lenin wrote: "The socialist movement...creates new and superior forms of human society in which the legitimate needs and progressive aspirations of the working masses of each nationality will, for the first time, be met through international unity...."

Today this has become the real practice of the big, close-knit and equal family of socialist states. Drawn into the all-embracing work to develop the cooperation of fraternal countries are not only the central guiding bodies, but also virtually all elements of our party, state and economic organism, as well as the most ramified network of public organizations, including, of course, the trade unions of our country.

Today, hundreds, thousands of Soviet people work in fraternal countries, helping our friends create most important economic projects such, for instance, as the huge "Katowice" metallurgical complex in Poland. Quite a few workers and specialists from fraternal countries work in our country as well. The joint construction project of socialist countries--the Orenburg-western border of the USSR gas pipeline advanced last year by 1,200 kilometres. This is a big success of the international collective of 15,000 builders. The day is not far now when the pipeline created by them, the biggest in Europe, will be commissioned.

All CEMA member-countries are taking part in developing the nickel industry in Cuba. The commencing specialization and cooperation of CEMA member-countries in the manufacture of equipment for atomic power stations is of great importance.

We all have grown accustomed to this and regard it as something quite natural. And this is good. It is good when close cooperation becomes an organic part of our consciousness, of our entire life.

The recent wonderful initiative of the collective of "Red Czepeľ," this glorious enterprise in People's Hungary, shows how powerful and vivifying are the roots of the fraternal relations linking the peoples of socialist countries. The workers of Czepeľ have started a socialist emulation movement in honour of the 60th anniversary of the Great October Revolution and assumed concrete pledges to fulfill export deliveries to the Soviet Union ahead of schedule. Similar initiatives have been made by workers in Bulgaria and the German Democratic Republic, Poland and Czechoslovakia.

Permit me from the rostrum of this congress to extend heartfelt gratitude to the working people of the fraternal countries for such an effective and moving expression of solidarity with the cause of the October Revolution, with our country, with our Communist Party. I believe I will express our common opinion if I say that the Soviet working class, all Soviet working people will worthily respond to the lofty initiatives of their foreign comrades, will respond with new deeds in communist construction, in developing our close cooperation.

If we think about it, comrades, what we have here is a qualitatively new phenomenon--an international movement of millions and millions of builders of the new world inspired by a single aim. This is a beginning of tremendous importance and it will have a big future.

In our foreign policy we and our socialist allies firmly adhere to the Leninist course of peace. Developing and deepening cooperation with countries which have freed themselves from the colonial yoke, interacting, where it is possible, with realistically-thinking circles in bourgeois states. The countries of socialism come out with concrete initiatives directed at improving the world's political climate. Precisely such proposals were made by the members of the Warsaw Treaty Organization at the November meeting of their Political Consultative Committee. The consistent struggle by the socialist community for peace and security of nations meets widespread understanding among the European and international public.

But in the world of capitalism there still exist influential political circles interested in disrupting the constructive international dialogue. The reactionary forces of the old world do not want to reconcile themselves to the growth and consolidation of the new.

For instance, they have now wish to reconcile themselves to the free, independent policy and progressive development of African and Asian states that have freed themselves from colonial oppression. The latest examples of this are the interference of NATO countries in the internal military conflict in Zaire and the new campaign of slander against the People's Republic of Angola. This is also shown by vicious assassinations of which prominent leaders of the national liberation struggle--the president of the People's Republic of the

Congo, Marien Nagouabi, and of the chairman of the Progressive Socialist Party of Lebanon, Kamal Junblatt, fell victim a few days ago. The Soviet people wrathfully condemn these assassinations.

"Operations" against the world of socialism are conducted no less stubbornly. Attempts are being made to weaken the socialist community and various means are employed to undermine the unity of its members. Attempts are also made to weaken the socialist system.

Our opponents would like to find some sort of forces opposed to socialism inside our countries. Since there are no such forces because in socialist society there are no oppressed, exploited classes, there are no oppressed, exploited nationalities, some sort of ersatz is being invented and the semblance of an "internal opposition" in socialist countries is being created by way of false publicity. That is the reason why the clamour about the so-called "dissidents" is organized, why a hullabaloo is raised about "violations of human rights" in countries of socialism.

What can be said about this? In our country it is not forbidden "to think differently" from the majority, to critically appraise various aspects of public life. We regard the comrades who come out with substantiated criticism, who strive to help matters, as conscientious critics and we are grateful to them. Those who criticize erroneously we regard as erring people.

It is another matter when several persons, who have broken away from our society, actively come out against the socialist system, embark on the road of anti-Soviet activity, violate laws and, having no support inside the country, turn for support abroad, to imperialist subversive centres--propaganda and intelligence centres. Our people demand that such so to speak public figures be treated as opponents of socialism, as persons acting against their own motherland, as accomplices, if not agents of imperialism. Quite naturally we have taken and will take against them measures envisaged by laws.

And in this matter let no one take offense: To protect the rights, freedoms and security of 260 million Soviet people from the activities of such renegades is not only our right, but is also our sacred duty. Duty to the people who under the guidance of the party of Lenin embarked on the road of building socialism and communism sixty years ago, to the people who, when defending the socialist motherland, their right to live the way they want, sacrificed 20 million lives in the great war against the fascist aggressors, precisely for the freedom and rights of the peoples, and who will never depart from their road!

As to the Soviet Union, we do not interfere in the internal affairs of other countries although, of course, we have quite a definite opinion about the order reigning in the world of imperialism, and do not conceal this opinion. In full accordance with the decisions of the 25th CPSU Congress we strive to build our relations with capitalist countries on the basis of long-term mutually advantageous cooperation in various spheres in the interests of strengthening universal peace.

The secretary of state of the United States, Mr Vance, is coming shortly to Moscow for negotiations. We will see what he will bring with him. Everybody, of course, realizes the importance of how Soviet-American relations will develop further. We would like these relations to be goodneighborly ones. But this requires a definite level of mutual understanding and at least a minimum of mutual tact.

We are convinced, of course, that the interests of the peoples of our two countries and of preserving universal peace will prevail and that relations between the USSR and the United States will eventually run a satisfactory course. The whole point is when this will take place, how much time will be lost during which many useful things could have been done.

If we are to speak of our relations with West European countries, they are developing, on the whole, quite well. In their time the USSR and France were so-to-say the trail blazers of detente and their mutual relations were described as "preferential" ones. To a certain extent this is true to this day: We are maintaining lively ties in the economic and cultural fields. We cooperate also in some foreign policy matters as well. The fact that the leaders of France, the FRG, Italy and Britain come out in support of the policy of relaxation of tension, the policy of peaceful cooperation is appreciated in the Soviet Union. In the field of relations between the USSR and the FRG much, it seems to us, can still be done and should be done. We have already covered some ground and this ought to be completed. As is known my visits to France and the FRG will give new impulses to the development of relations with these countries.

The recent restoration of the USSR's relations with Spain was a noticeable event in Europe's political life. Lately we have developed quite a good cooperation with that country, mostly in economic matters. Now, one should believe, our relations will be further developed. We are following with interest the process of democratization of political life in Spain and wish the Spanish people further successes along this road.

Comrades, twenty months have passed since the day when the heads of state and government of 35 countries affixed their signatures to the final act of the European Conference on Security and Cooperation. During this period peace in Europe has become stronger, while economic, cultural and other ties and contacts among countries have become noticeable broader and richer. We in the Soviet Union welcome this. We want detente to continue. We will assist this in every way because this is demanded by the interests of the peoples.

Preparations have now started in participant countries of the Helsinki conference for the Belgrade meeting, the first collective meeting of their representatives after Helsinki. On our part we want a constructive business-like discussion by sovereign partners to take place there. The conference in Helsinki, as is known, was called a Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe. That is why we hold that concern for peace and security in Europe, for developing cooperation between the European peoples should become the main content of the Belgrade meeting. Not simply to sum up what has already been done but also to reach agreement on some concrete recommendations and proposals on questions of further cooperation--such, in our view, are the main tasks of the meeting in the Yugoslav capital.

I will say a few words about the present situation in this field.

First of all, about Soviet-American relations to whose positive development we have always attached and continue to attach much importance. I would say that the situation in this field, at present, is determined by three basic factors. The first is the sound foundation in the form of the important treaties and agreements on cooperation in various fields concluded in 1972-1974. The second is the state of certain stagnation. The American side at first explained it by the election campaign in the United States, but the first two months of the new administration's stay in power in Washington do not seem to show a striving to overcome this stagnation. And, last, the third factor-- the existence of big objective possibilities for further developing equal and mutually advantageous cooperation in various spheres for the good of both countries and universal peace.

In this connection I will mention several concrete and, as we believe, quite attainable tasks. Firstly, the completion of the drafting and the signing of a new agreement on the limitation of strategic offensive arms, that was agreed upon in the main already in 1974, and further advance on this basis to a mutual reduction of armaments with strict observance of the principle of equality and undiminished security of the sides. Then there are possible joint initiatives of the USSR and the United States in the field of banning and liquidating the most dangerous lethal types of chemical weapons, and other measures restraining the arms race and strengthening the security of the peoples. There is also the extensive development of mutually advantageous trade and economic ties on the basis of a removal of discriminatory barriers created by the United States and the entry into force of agreements on these questions that were signed already long ago. Lastly, these tasks include concerted actions by our countries to achieve a just and lasting peace settlement in the Middle East.

We are for actively using all these possibilities. But there also exist circumstances directly opposing a further improvement and development of Soviet-American relations. One of them is the ballooning of the slanderous campaign about the mythical "military menace" posed by the USSR. I have already spoken on this matter recently. The other circumstance is constituted by outright attempts by official American bodies to interfere in the internal affairs of the Soviet Union.

But Washington's claims to teach others how to live, I believe, cannot be accepted by any sovereign state, not to mention the fact that neither the situation in the United States, itself nor U.S. actions and policies in the world at large give justification to such claims.

I will repeat again: We will not tolerate interference in our internal affairs by anyone and under any pretext. A normal development of relations on such a basis is of course, unthinkable.

The Soviet Union has always firmly upheld and will uphold its sovereign rights, its dignity and its interests. At the same time a constructive, realistic approach by the other side will always encounter our understanding and readiness to reach agreement.

The Middle East is another area that continues to attract attention. A noticeable increase in diplomatic activity is observed there in recent weeks. Judging by every thing, the resumption of the Geneva conference is gradually becoming an ever more realistic matter. Such a course of events, naturally, can only be welcomed.

But the conference in Geneva, of course, is not an end in itself. Fruitful and just results of its work are the main thing. It goes without saying that the drawing up of peace terms in all their details is primarily a matter for the conflicting sides themselves. But the Soviet Union, as a co-chairman of the Geneva conference and a state situated in direct proximity of the area in question, has its own opinion about the main principles and directions of the future peace settlement.

We hold, in particular, that the final document (or documents) on peace in the Middel East should be based on the principle of the impermissibility of acquisition of territory by war or war, on the right of all states of the area to independent existence and security. It goes without saying that the inalienable rights of the Palestine Arab people should be ensured, including its right to self-determination, to the creation of its own state.

We regard as unquestionable that the documents on peace should provide for the withdrawal of Israeli troops from all Arab territories occupied in 1967. Such a withdrawal could be carried out not at once, but in stages, in the course, say, of several months, within strictly defined datelines. The appropriate border lines between Israel and its Arab neighbors, participants in the conflict, should be clearly defined. These borders should be declared finally established and inviolable.

We proceed from the premise that from the moment of the completion of the withdrawal of Israeli troops the state of war between the Arab states, participating in the conflict, and Israel will be ended and relations of peace established. In this all sides will undertake mutual obligations to respect each other's sovereignty, territorial integrity, inviolability and political independence, and resolve their international disputes by peaceful means.

Demilitarized zones, without unilateral advantages for any party, could be created on both sides of the established borders, of course, with the consent of the respective states. Either a United Nations emergency force or United Nations observers could be stationed within these zones for some clearly stipulated period of time.

Evidently, the final documents of the conference should contain also a provision about free passage for ships of all countries, including Israel (after the ending of the state of war) through the Strait of Tiran and the Aqaba Gulf, as well as a statement by Egypt about the passage of ships through the Suez Canal which is entirely under Egyptian sovereignty.

In our opinion the fullfillment of the terms of the peace settlement could be guaranteed, should the contracting parties so desire, by the United Nations Security Council or, perhaps, by individual powers, for instance, the Soviet Union, the United States, France, Britain. The guarantor states could have their observers in the United Nations contingents in the respective zones.

Such, comrades, are our preliminary ideas, in briefest form, on the possible mainstays of a just peace in the Middle East. We are not imposing them on anyone, but find it useful to let them be known, just as we, naturally, will be prepared to hear the views of others.

We already said that in connection with a peace settlement in the Middle East the relevant states could study the question of facilitating an ending of the arms race in that area. In general, the problem of international arms trade seems to merit an exchange of views.

Now a few words about the problem of limiting arms and disarmament, which was defined by the 25th congress as the central problem of ensuring peace and security of peoples.

I have already touched on the Soviet-American Strategic Arms Limitation Talks. The question of prohibiting all nuclear weapon tests is an extremely important and pressing one. This would have exerted a beneficial influence on our planet's life both in the direct, biological, and in the moral-political aspects. It is no less important also that a restriction would be imposed on possibilities of qualitatively perfecting nuclear arms and on the appearance of new types of such weapons.

For a long time the opponents of the full prohibition of nuclear weapon tests referred to difficulties in settling the question of control. We are convinced to this day, and this is substantiated by specialists, that national means of detection are quite sufficient for control. Nevertheless, to clear the road to agreement, the Soviet Union has made a serious step towards the Western powers. Our draft treaty on the full and general prohibition of nuclear weapon tests now provides for the possibility of on-the-spot inspection, on a voluntary basis, in the event of any doubts concerning the fulfillment of the treaty commitments by some country. This is a reasonable compromise that takes into account the positions of all sides.

Quite naturally the full ending of nuclear weapon tests will set in only when all nuclear powers accede to the treaty. Only then will the treaty truly serve its aims.

We attentively follow the reaction in various countries to the proposal by Warsaw Treaty countries that all participant states of the European conference undertake not to be the first to use nuclear weapons against each other. I would want statesmen of Western countries, and first of all members of NATO, to give much thought to the meaning of this important proposal and depart from the thoughtless, mechanical approach according to which if a proposal comes from the other side it must be a dangerous one and should therefore be rejected.

It is time to realize that the policy which concentrates on the threat of using nuclear weapons and on readiness to use them is becoming ever more dangerous to mankind. From the first days of the appearance of nuclear weapons the Soviet Union is coming out for their prohibition and destruction. It was so when the United States had a monopoly on nuclear weapons, and so it is now when all admit the equality of the nuclear might of the USSR and the United States.

When questions of disarmament are discussed one hears quite frequently about the possibility and usefulness of employing the practice of mutual example, that is of some unilateral positive actions by states in the hope that others will respond in the spirit. Perhaps, such a method could also be used. But it will produce an effect only in conditions of mutual goodwill and mutual trust.

I will cite one concrete example, talks on the reduction of armed forces and armaments in central Europe began four years ago. Talks on reduction. What could be more logical and natural, it would seem, than for the participants in the talks to refrain at least from increasing their armed forces in the area while the talks are in progress. Precisely this was proposed several times by the USSR together with its allies. For a number of years already we are not increasing the size of our armed forces in central Europe. How did NATO countries react to this example offered by us? They continued to build up their armed forces there.

What are we to do now? Maybe the Soviet Union should follow the example of Western powers? But that is a negative example and, frankly speaking, we would not want to follow it.

Today we declare once again: "We are prepared not to increase the numerical strength of our troops in central Europe till the attainment of agreement on the reduction of armed forces and armaments in that area. On condition, of course, that the NATO forces there will not grow either. Accept this proposal, esteemed partners in the talks, accept it as the first real step on the road to reducing armed forces! To be sure, nobody stands to lose from this, while the cause of peace, the cause of the security of the peoples will only gain. [quotation marks as received]

Comrades, the Soviet people has weathered many trials. It has passed through the flames of war, experienced the sorrow of losses and the joy of victories. The happy life which Soviet people have created for themselves by their own hands is a well-deserved award for all this. A well-reserved award for this and for the thirty-two peaceful years which we have already had since the ending of the war. This, I believe, is the lengthiest period of peace in the entire centuries-long history of our country. Meantime wars and armed conflicts have flared up in the world more than a hundred times in the period since 1945 alone.

The Soviet people appreciates the peaceloving policy of its party. It is prepared to make everything for peace to become stable, lasting and reliable, and is doing everything for this. I can tell you, comrades, that for me, just as for everyone of us, communists, whom the party, the people have entrusted with the country's foreign policy matters, have no greater duty and no greater happiness than to work in the name of this wonderful, humane aim.

Dear comrades, the 16th congress of Soviet trade unions is being held in a remarkable anniversary year for our country: The banner of the October Revolution hoisted by the working people of Russia, the party of communists, the party of Leninists is flying aloft for already 60 years.

An anniversary year is always a year of reminiscences, a year of summing up results. But we, communists, look back not only to note with lawful pride the scope, the historic importance of what has been done. For us the past is an infinitely rich reservoir of experience, material for thought, for a critical analysis of our own decisions and actions. In the past we draw inspiration for our present and future deeds.

The results of the past year and the first two months of the present year show that the country continues to advance confidently along the course of the 25th congress. But much, very much is yet to be done. This naturally fully applies to the trade unions as well whose prime duty this year is to give active support to the emulation movement in honour of the 60th anniversary of the Great October Revolution.

I am convinced that the new composition of the All-Union Central Council of Trade Unions will be equal to the political responsibility that is required of all of us by the times, by life, by our very complex but at the same time very interesting epoch.

In conclusion I have a pleasant announcement for you. Permit me to read out the decree of the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of the USSR "On awarding the Order of the October Revolution to the trade unions of the USSR."

(To the stormy applause of the delegates and guests of the congress, Comrade L. I. Brezhnev read the decree of the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of the USSR on awarding the Order of the October Revolution to the trade unions of the USSR. A fervent ovation broke out in the hall when Leonid Il'ich Brezhnev attached the order to the AUCCTU banner. Everybody stands. Stormy ovation.)

Permit me also to hand over to the presidium a message of greetings from the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union to the 16th congress of trade unions of the USSR.

I wish you all, comrades, and those who delegated you this congress big successes in work, sound health and a fighting spirit!

LAW OF GRADUAL RAPPROCHEMENT AMONG SOCIALIST COUNTRIES

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 5, Mar 77 pp 20-31

[Article by B. Ladygin and Yu. Pekshev]

[Text] The conclusion of the objective law of the gradual and comprehensive rapprochement among socialist countries plays an important role among the theoretical concepts formulated by the 25th CPSU Congress. Summing up the historical experience of world socialism--a qualitatively new level reached in the development of the revolutionary process, initiated by the Great October Revolution--Comrade L. I. Brezhnev, CPSU Central Committee general secretary, formulated and substantiated this concept in the Central Committee report to the congress as follows: "Together with the blossoming of each socialist nation and the strengthening of the sovereignty of the socialist states their mutual relations are becoming ever closer; an ever greater number of common elements are appearing in their politics, economics, and social life. Development levels are being gradually equalized. This process of gradual rapprochement among socialist countries is manifested quite definitely today as a pattern." This theoretical conclusion was confirmed and concretized at the congresses of the BKP, SED, Communist Party of Czechoslovakia, and Mongolian People's Revolutionary Party, which followed the 25th CPSU Congress. Thus, a new step was taken in the collective summing up of the practice of world socialism and in the joint creative development of the single international doctrine--Marxism-Leninism.

Knowledge of the laws governing the gradual rapprochement among fraternal countries is of important significance to the elaboration and implementation of the long-term policy of the ruling communist parties. The materials of their last congresses offer an impressive picture of growing mutual relations both in the economies of CEMA-member countries, in which an integration process is developing successfully, as well as in politics, where interparty relations, foreign political coordination, ideological cooperation, scientific and cultural exchanges, and a great variety of contacts among public organizations and broad toiling strata are intensifying rapidly.

The high dynamism of the socioeconomic growth of each fraternal country, all-round cooperation, and a progressing process of equalization of development levels among socialist countries objectively lead to the multiplication and intensification of features of similarity and community of political and economic life. The main trends of this multiple-level rapprochement are manifested at the present stage quite clearly and stably, showing the international nature of the new social system and vividly proving the successes of the policies pursued by the ruling fraternal parties based on the creative application of the laws governing the building of socialism and communism, first embodied in the practice of the Great October Revolution.

1

We know that the Marxist-Leninist classics considered the nations and national states appearing under capitalism as historical categories and inevitable steps on the path followed by mankind to a communist future. They saw the progress of production forces, the all-round socialization of labor and production and the socialist revolutions, which create solid prerequisites for the true blossoming of the nations and their gradual rapprochement, as necessary prerequisites for progress along this path.

The theoretical and practical formulation of the problem of internationalization of social, material, and spiritual life itself and its historical and logical completion in the transition of all mankind to communism turned out to be possible only at a given stage, when, after creating nations and national states, capitalism began to break down national barriers. The deep origins of this process may be reduced, in the final account, to the effect of economic factors. Studying the evolution of capitalism under the influence of the industrial revolution, Marx substantiated the legitimate nature of the all-round socialization of labor and production and the involvement, on this basis, of all nations in the network of the world's market. The material foundation of this process is large-scale machine industry which, as V. I. Lenin said, is the combining and socializing element (see "Poln. Sobr. Soch." [Complete Collected Works], volume 2, page 235).

The socialization of labor and output, independently of its social form, is manifested in international conditions (in the realm of intergovernmental relations) in the trend toward the internationalization of output which, in turn, is the core, the decisive direction of the common process of internationalization of material and spiritual life. Marx and Engels wrote that "National isolation and opposition among nations are disappearing to an ever-greater extent with the development of the bourgeoisie, free trade, a world market, and the uniformity of industrial output and its corresponding living conditions. The rule of the proletariat will accelerate their disappearance even further" (K. Marx and F. Engels, "Soch." [Works], volume 4, page 444). Elaborating this concept, Lenin pointed out that "The entire economic, political, and spiritual life of mankind is becoming evermore internationalized already under capitalism. Socialism internationalizes it entirely" ("Poln. Sobr. Soch.," volume 23, page 318).

The appearance and intensification of trends toward internationalization were linked by the Marxist-Leninist classics not only with the progress of production forces, which gradually outstripped national-state boundaries, but also with the development of the class structure of society. As early as 1845, in one of his early works, Engels noted that "The awakening proletariat alone could establish the fraternity among different nations" (K. Marx and F. Engels, "Soch.," volume 2, page 590).

The working class of one or another individual country is the bearer of and spokesman for the national interests and true patriotism. At the same time it is part of the international proletariat which expresses the basic aspirations of all mankind, the interest of total elimination of exploitation and, in the final account, the creation of a classless communist society on a worldwide scale. The working class acts as the main subject and promoter of the socialization of labor and production within the individual countries and on an international scale. Its double interests--national and international--not only do not conflict with each other but, conversely, are interdependent. The entire history of the struggle waged by the peoples of many countries for national liberation and new social relations convincingly proves the organic interconnection between true patriotism and internationalism.

The revolutions headed by the working class are a necessary prerequisite both for the blossoming of the individual nations and for intensifying the trends toward the internationalization of the material and spiritual life of the nations. This is not a mere extension of that which took place and is occurring under capitalism. Following the establishment of the world's socialist system a higher type of internationalization developed, based on a socialist and essentially collectivistic means of production. As the new social system becomes more mature in the individual countries and assumes the features of a qualitative integrity the process of socialist internationalization of material and spiritual life as well becomes comprehensive.

The reaching of higher levels of development by the new society in the individual countries, naturally, leads to growing similarity of their economic and political structures. At the same time, regardless of the level of socialist maturity reached by the individual countries, all of them share a number of common essential features and characteristics revealing their genetic similarity and affiliation with the communist system. It is a question of the socialized ownership of capital goods, planned economic management in the interest of the working people, the leading role of the working class, headed by the Marxist-Leninist vanguard, and so on. Therefore, it is a question of the common laws of the building of socialism and communism, objectively operating on the basis of the new production method and of its inherent political system.

Currently the international relations of world socialism have also established their common features. Its economic laws operate specifically in this area, objectively based on the political and economic sovereignty of the socialist states. They are the totally independent owners of the capital goods located on their territory. They insure autonomously the planned utilization of their production forces in the interest of the people, determining the measure of labor and consumption, and the volume and trends of foreign economic relations. As was predicted by the founders of scientific communism, public ownership appears initially within individual nations (see K. Marx and F. Engels, "Soch.," volume 37, page 380), subsequently developing into the "harmonious national and international coordination of social forms of output" (K. Marx and F. Engels, "Soch.," volume 17, page 553). Speaking of production internationalization, its development under present-day conditions and within the foreseeable future does not affect the sovereignty of the fraternal states or dilute the national-state form of socialized ownership of capital goods. This influences the nature of superstructural relations as well.

The experience in the development of world socialism and the joint decisions earmarking the prospects for cooperation among fraternal countries refute the bourgeois-revisionist myths of an allegedly supranational or coercive nature of their relations. Relations among such countries are built and developed through voluntary coordination, on a contractual basis, on the basis of Marxism-Leninism and of organically interrelated principles: socialist internationalism, respect for state sovereignty, independence, and national interests, noninterference in domestic affairs, total equality, mutual advantages, and comradely mutual aid. Determining the ways, trends, and pace of development of such interaction, the ruling communist and worker parties proceed from the specific conditions governing the building of socialism in their countries and the characteristics of their international situation. It is precisely such principles that are the basis for the long-term policy pursued by the CPSU and the other fraternal parties for improving reciprocal cooperation.

Capitalist internationalization develops differently. Private ownership relations inevitably turn the bourgeois world into a society with sharp conflicts with inherent national egotism and rivalry, domination and subordination, and dictate and exploitation. In the international arena as well the private capitalist forms of acquisition irreconcilably conflict with the social nature of the production process. Hence, along with trends for the internationalization of the material and spiritual life of society, also steadily reproducing itself is a trend toward separation, exclusivity, intergovernmental conflicts, and international enmity. Marx wrote that in the world's capitalist economy "Universal ties and all-round dependence of production and consumption grow together with the reciprocal independence and indifference of consumers and producers..." (K. Marx and F. Engels, "Soch.," volume 46, part I, page 104). That is precisely why the exploiting system will never be able to bring to its conclusion the trend toward internationalization.

Socialism alone, having put an end to class antagonism, leads to the total disappearance of national antagonism. However, this does not eliminate the need for retaining in a given historical epoch national-state autonomy and for strengthening the sovereignty of the socialist states. Along with these interests, the steady socioeconomic and cultural progress of each fraternal country and their comity as a whole objectively demand the ever closer coordination of their efforts. This confirms Lenin's words that "Under socialism the toiling masses themselves will never agree to isolation for purely economic...reasons..." ("Poln. Sobr. Soch.," volume 30, page 37).

Under the new socioeconomic conditions the trend toward internationalization is developing and becoming richer, acquiring the aspect of voluntary gradual rapprochement among socialist countries in the fields of economics, politics, ideology, and culture. It is a rejection of the reactionary aspects of capitalist internationalization and represents the further expansion and intensification, on a new basis, of international labor, scientific and cultural cooperation, mass human contacts, and so on. It is precisely the method of gradual voluntary rapprochement that successfully combines the trend toward internationalization with the strengthening of the sovereignty of the individual countries.

The rapprochement among the socialist countries is a complex set of inter-related processes of cooperation and reciprocal contacts aimed at insuring the factual equality of all nations and their all-round blossoming, and the strengthening of their unity and solidarity. This is a method for combining economic internationalization with cooperation in the fields of politics and ideology and the equalization of the levels of development of the countries and their reaching of higher stages of socialist maturity inherent in the new society. With the rapprochement the similarity and community of problems resolved intensify; the common interests are combined better with specific national interests. The gradual rapprochement among fraternal countries is manifested in the strengthening and development of the world's comity of fraternal peoples of the socialist countries--an international union of a new type.

The new social system created the objective and subjective conditions for converting the friendship among socialist countries into a political category and for the establishment of their comity. This is objectively based on the very nature of the new production relations, the nature of the socialist political system, and the unity of objectives and of Marxist-Leninist ideology. Through the efforts of the CPSU and the other ruling communist and worker parties the friendship among the peoples--a powerful motive force of the new society--was fruitfully displayed in international conditions. It is the intermediary in the process of economic, political, ideological, and cultural rapprochement. No other way is possible, for without the establishment of friendly relations among nations it is impossible to secure factors such as reciprocal trust, international solidarity, and fraternal mutual aid.

The unification among socialist countries is steadily intensifying despite the attempts of the class enemies to promote among them complications and mistrust and to distort the nature of their reciprocal relations. The best answer to the ill-wishers is the multiplication of efforts aimed at the further unification among socialist countries, intensification of multi-lateral cooperation, and strengthening of friendly relations above all among members of the Warsaw Pact and CEMA, as well as among socialist states naturally gravitating toward them.

Long experience has confirmed that the truest path to all-round socioeconomic progress by the socialist states goes not through isolation but only through fraternal cooperation, mutual aid, and the strengthening of friendship.

2

The gradual rapprochement among socialist countries is historical. It showed itself as an objective trend with the very first steps in the organization of the new world system. With the transition from relatively simple forms of comity and interaction to evermore complex and profound ones, and with the growth of similar features of problems to be resolved and the equalization of development levels of fraternal countries the trend toward rapprochement is beginning to manifest itself as a law, i.e., as a profound and durable trend of social development. The broad and many-faceted process of rapprochement among socialist states is manifested with particular clarity as a law precisely at the present stage in the development of world socialism, when many countries are beginning to convert to the mature forms of the new society, and when mature forms of cooperation among fraternal countries in all directions are beginning to develop.

The growth of one or another intensifying trend in the development of economic and political processes into a law is not a purely socialist phenomenon. The history of different systems is replete with many examples of the growth of initially sketchy development trends of one or another social phenomenon into a natural characteristic of a specific social organism. We could also refer to the history of the establishment of international relations of a new type. The very establishment of CEMA and the subsequent transition to coordination of national economic plans reflected a trend toward the appearance and development of an integration process within the framework of the gradually developing world socialist economy. However, it was only the effect of specific socioeconomic factors at a specific historical period that turned the conversion of this trend into a law governing world socialism and into a decisive material prerequisite and an element of the entire process of gradual rapprochement among CEMA-member countries.

The study of an entire group of factors made it possible to determine clearly the effect of the law governing the gradual rapprochement among fraternal countries at the present stage.

The past congresses of ruling communist and worker parties clearly proved the increased similarity of the socioeconomic problems resolved by the socialist countries. As we know, at the beginning of the 1970's the Soviet Union was the first country in the world to build a developed socialist society. Today a number of other countries are also building it successfully. Their levels of economic development have also become substantially similar. All CEMA European countries, for example, are now industrial-agrarian countries in whose economy heavy industry predominates.

Yet, relatively not so long ago, during the existence of the present generation, they were characterized by quite profound disparities in development levels. In the first years of building a new life industry predominated over agriculture only in the GDR and Czechoslovakia. Hungary and Poland were economically backward agro-industrial states. Bulgaria and Romania were at an even lower economic level. Suffice it to point out, for example, that in 1950 the per capita production of electric power was 110 kilowatt-hours in Bulgaria and 130 in Romania. This was 9 to 10 times below the GDR level. In 1975 Bulgaria reached 2,893 and Romania 2,528 kilowatt-hours, which is over 50 percent of the GDR level (5,015 kilowatt-hours).

Using the basic advantages offered by the new production method, including the international socialist division of labor, the previously economically backward CEMA-member countries made unparalleled progress. Between 1951 and 1975 Bulgarian industrial output rose 18 times; Romanian industrial output rose 21 times whereas, meanwhile, CEMA industrial output rose approximately 10 times.

Having reached a more or less homogenous economic structure and having maximally mobilized extensive factors for economic growth, now all European socialist countries are converting to the utilization of primarily intensive factors based on production concentration, and scientific-production and agro-industrial integration. Priority is given to increasing production effectiveness and work quality. The planned foundations of economic management are being intensified and improved. The main objective of socialist output--upgrading the people's prosperity--is being implemented more fully than ever before. A qualitatively new way of life has developed. In other words, the process of production socialization has reached a new level in many socialist countries. This intensifies the common nature of their basic economic interests and the need for more intensive economic interaction.

Largely similar tasks now face most fraternal countries in terms of improving the political system which is following the path of the growth of the state of proletarian dictatorship into an all-national state with an all-round development of socialist democracy. It is no accident that it is precisely in recent years that most of them have either renovated their constitutional foundations or are taking steps in this direction. The profound social restructuring of the socialist countries is characterized by the increased strength and role of the working class. This makes possible the fuller and more systematic implementation of its patriotic and international mission.

A qualitatively new step was taken in the development of relations among socialist countries as well. Within a historically short period of time they developed, tried, and applied socialist ways and means of international division of labor. This became an essential factor for the blossoming of the national economies. In this connection let us particularly emphasize the creation of an overall system of cooperation in the field of planning, foreign trade, and monetary relations, and production and scientific and technical cooperation.

The gradual ripening of the elements of socialist economic integration prepared the conditions and, at a specific stage, created the possibility for the collective elaboration of a joint program document formulating the principles, directions, and forms of all-round economic cooperation among CEMA-member countries for the foreseeable future. The elaboration, adoption, and implementation of the comprehensive program for socialist economic integration solidly placed all economic interaction among CEMA-member countries on the tracks of an all-round intensification of mutual division of labor, and intensified effective reciprocal supplementing of national economic complexes. This is an important political document and a program for specific practical steps taken by sovereign countries for the creation of optimal conditions for their economic rapprochement and for the development of trends toward production internationalization. Having reached a specific level of maturity, this trend objectively can no longer develop in the new world comity in any form other than that of economic integration. It is natural, therefore, that starting with the 1970's, the CEMA-member countries converted from individual measures to an expanded process of socialist economic integration--at the given historical stage the highest form of internationalization of economic life of mankind.

The economic integration is an organic part of the general process of rapprochement among socialist countries. Obviously, this cannot be achieved without economic integration or isolated from it. The other, nonmaterial, aspect of the rapprochement process--the interrelationship among fraternal countries in superstructural fields--is based on a corresponding economic foundation, on the cooperation among nations in the main realm of human activities--material output. On the other hand, it is also clear that economic integration as well cannot successfully develop without corresponding mature forms of socialist international relations in the superstructural area, without a strengthening political-ideological unity which insures favorable political prerequisites and provides the necessary class direction to the entire effort of rapprochement among the economies of CEMA-member countries. This confirms, yet once again, the dialectics of relations between economics and politics under socialism discovered by Lenin.

Therefore, the gradual rapprochement presumes the existence of a synchronized process of intensified reciprocal relations in all directions--economics, politics, and ideology. Its contemporary forms presume the reaching of a certain stage of maturity in all principal realms of interaction among the

nations of sovereign countries. It is no accident that it was precisely the 1970's that became the years of a stage in the development of this process. Unquestionably, they will occupy an outstanding position in the history of world socialism thanks to the appearance and establishment of qualitatively new and higher forms of relations in economics and in other fields of social life.

In economics the interrelated development of the CEMA-member countries made possible an unparalleled absolute growth of their overall national economic potential. Between 1971 and 1975 the national income of the CEMA-member countries rose 36 percent while industrial output rose nearly 50 percent. Let us also bear in mind that today 1 percent of their overall national income is the equivalent of 6 percent in 1950 while 1 percent of industrial output is the equivalent of 10 percent 25 years ago. These successes become particularly striking against the background of the crisis of the capitalist economy in the 1970's. Today the CEMA comity has become the most dynamic economic force in the world.

The reciprocal complementing of the economic complexes of CEMA-member countries has intensified substantially. The growth of their reciprocal trade between 1971 and 1975 exceeded its entire absolute growth over the previous 20 years. Never before has joint construction been carried out on such a scale; never before has intrasectorial cooperation and scientific and technical cooperation become so deep. The planned interaction among CEMA-member countries has assumed a new quality. For the first time in the history of this organization a coordinated plan was elaborated for multilateral integration measures for the current five years. In accordance with the desire of the ruling communist and worker parties the 30th CEMA session unanimously passed a historical decision calling for the elaboration of long-term target programs for cooperation in five key realms of material output.

The international prestige of CEMA principles and methods of activity has never been higher. It was precisely in the 1970's that CEMA became an organization operating on an intercontinental scale. It was joined by Cuba and is cooperating with Finland, Mexico, Iraq, and Angola. Yugoslavia, Vietnam, and the Democratic People's Republic of Korea are regularly participating in the work of CEMA authorities. CEMA was accredited by the United Nations.

As a whole, as was emphasized at the 30th CEMA session, more was achieved in the five years of implementation of the complex program than in the preceding decade. This proves the effectiveness of the economic rapprochement among the economies of the socialist countries.

In politics the further change in the ratio of forces in favor of socialism and the closely coordinated actions of the fraternal countries brought about, in the 1970's, the outstanding results for which world socialism had struggled for many years. The peace program formulated at the 24th CPSU

Congress and supported by the other fraternal parties was implemented. The implementation of its organic extension--the program for the further struggle for peace and international cooperation, and for the freedom and independence of the nations, formulated at the 25th CPSU Congress--was undertaken. Detente became a reality, asserting in fact the principle of peaceful coexistence. Particularly tangible changes in this respect occurred on the European continent, assisted by the historical Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe. GDR sovereignty was universally acknowledged. The western boundaries of the GDR, Poland, and Czechoslovakia were confirmed internationally. Despite the intrigues of American imperialism Cuba defended its independence and took a new big step in the development of the new system. The Vietnamese people won an outstanding victory. United Vietnam is the third biggest socialist state in terms of population. A new member joined the family of socialist countries--the People's Democratic Republic of Laos.

All these outstanding successes were largely based on the growing political unity of socialist countries and the strengthening of their alliance both on a bilateral basis and within the framework of the Warsaw Pact, within which the mechanism of their foreign political interaction has developed and is successfully operating.

Under contemporary conditions the significance of the Warsaw Pact function of coordinating the foreign political actions of the fraternal countries in the struggle for the preservation and consolidation of the peace and for the creation of the most favorable external conditions for the building of socialism and communism becomes particularly important. In recent years its Political Consultative Committee has launched initiatives which became the basis for decisions adopted at major international assemblies or were reflected in a number of important bilateral intergovernmental acts. Addressing the 25th CPSU Congress, Comrade E. Gierek, first secretary of the Polish United Workers Party Central Committee, noted: "The political and defense alliance of the Warsaw Pact members, insuring the security of our peoples, has also become the base for more energetic actions aimed at detente and at expanding peaceful relations between countries with different social systems."

This line was developed further at the 1976 Bucharest conference of the Warsaw Pact Political Consultative Committee. The declaration it adopted contains new major initiatives consistent with the basic interests of the nations. The measures earmarked to broaden the effective interaction among fraternal countries in international affairs are also of major basic significance. They will be assisted by the creation of a committee of ministers of foreign affairs and a joint secretariat, and by consultative meetings among members of parliament and representatives of the public, as well as contacts among labor collectives and private citizens.

In recent years major progress was made in ideological cooperation among socialist countries. Regular meetings among leading ideological workers of CEMA-member countries were organized. They provide a new impetus to the development of various relations in the fields of ideology, science, culture, and education. The share of collective studies in the fields of the social sciences has increased. Cooperation among mass information media has become closer. All this was dictated by reality itself, for the ideological struggle has assumed the foreground in the confrontation between the two opposing systems. The 25th CPSU Congress and the regular congresses held by the other ruling parties demonstrated the loyalty of the communists of the fraternal countries to Marxism-Leninism, and their resolve systematically to defend its principles in the struggle against bourgeois ideology and revisionism.

The development of all-round cooperation among fraternal countries in ideology and culture is of tremendous significance also to the further development of Marxism-Leninism on the basis of the very rich collective experience gained in building a new life. Thus, the joint elaboration, through the collective efforts of the CPSU and the fraternal communist and worker parties, of the concept of a developed socialist society is a major creative contribution to its treasury.

Each socialist country has acquired long experience in building the new system under specific national conditions. Its social practice and the experience of the other fraternal countries substantially enrich scientific socialism both in terms of the manifestation and confirmation of the general characteristics of the new world as well as the specific ways and means for building it.

The communists the world over are particularly interested in the experience of the Soviet Union. This is not only because it is the first socialist country celebrating this year the 60th anniversary of its birth but also because the USSR has reached the highest level of maturity of the socialist society and of contemporary social progress. "The past of the Soviet Union, " said Comrade J. Kadar, first secretary of the Hungarian Socialist Workers Party Central Committee, addressing the 25th CPSU Congress, "is a great historical lesson. Its present is an example for emulation, while its future offers brilliant prospects for the peoples of the world....the historical experience of the Soviet Union is always worthy of attention and will never lose its significance."

3

Studying the rapprochement among socialist countries problems of the gradual nature and the characteristic of specific means as the typical and necessary symptoms of this natural process are substantial, theoretically and politically. They are objectively based by the complexity and length of time in the development of the new world system. In turn, it is determined also by

the different times at which the socialist revolutions were made and the very different initial levels of the economic, social, and cultural development of the individual countries, the extent of the gravity of their class struggle, and a number of other circumstances. Lenin did not allow a simplistic approach to the creation of a fraternal alliance among nations. He emphasized that this must be reached through the greatest possible patience and caution in order not to fail or create mistrust, and to allow time for the surmounting of the mistrust left by centuries of oppression by the exploiting classes (see "Poln. Sobr. Soch.," volume 40, page 43). These thoughts are fully taken into consideration by the CPSU and the fraternal parties in implementing a systematic line of strengthening the unity of world socialism. Addressing the meeting of heads of academies of sciences of socialist countries this past February, Comrade L. I. Brezhnev emphasized that it would be wrong to accelerate artificially, to urge on, the process of rapprochement among fraternal countries. However, it would also be an error to hinder and hold it back.

Bourgeois propaganda is trying to depict matters as though any new step forward in the internationalization of social life and in the rapprochement among fraternal countries brings about a limitation of their sovereignty, elimination of national-state characteristics, the creation of a supra-national center, and so on. In a number of cases the principle of proletarian and socialist internationalism is given a deliberately distorted interpretation. It is pitted against other principles governing the development of the socialist comity, in particular that of the independence of fraternal parties and states. In fact, the entire foundation for the rapprochement among socialist countries is qualitatively homogenous and fully insures the possibility for combining harmoniously national with international interests and socialist patriotism with internationalism. This foundation enables our countries to develop reciprocal cooperation not only without abandoning national interests but, conversely, effectively implementing their state sovereignty. It makes it possible to give the process of rapprochement a certain sequence based on factual possibilities.

Any artificial acceleration of the process of rapprochement could have adverse consequences. Consequently, it is exceptionally important to determine scientifically its optimal pace, adopt a differentiated approach, and take into consideration the specific interest and readiness of a given country to follow one or another direction and form of cooperation. It is important always to study the process of equalization of the levels of development of socialist countries and the specific nature of the contemporary stage reached in their socioeconomic progress and characteristics of their international position.

Relations among fraternal countries suffer no cliches and could be based only on the profound study and interpretation of the specific historical circumstances within each of them and the consequent requirements. Clearly, even countries which have reached essentially different levels of socialist maturity (such as, for example, the USSR and Mongolia) share basic features

of similarity which determine the ways and means for the development of their all-round cooperation. This was most clearly stated in the decisions of the 17th Congress of the Mongolian People's Revolutionary Party. On the other hand, relations between the USSR and Mongolia have major characteristics compared with the development of all-round cooperation between the Soviet Union and countries already building a mature socialist society. Yet, within this group of countries as well bilateral relations are not given the same treatment in the least. Thus, the successfully developing process of rapprochement between the USSR and Bulgaria has its own characteristics. Many problems arise in the course of combining bilateral with multilateral forms of cooperation. A practice has been solidly established in which the individual socialist country participates in multilateral measures to the extent of its interest and readiness.

Naturally, such tasks are implemented not spontaneously but through deliberate and purposeful guidance provided by the communist and worker parties. The active interparty cooperation alone makes possible their proper solution. The determining role of this cooperation in the organization of the entire set of political, economic, ideological, and cultural relations among fraternal countries is fully consistent with the legitimate intensification of the leading role of Marxist-Leninist parties in all processes involved in the building of a new society.

The very foundation for the close interaction among socialist countries and its soul and guiding and organizing force is the combat alliance of communist parties. A variety of systematic contacts among communists, ranging from party leaders to the personnel of local party organs and party organizations of production collectives, have been, and remain, one of the main prerequisites for the consolidation of sovereign nations. The communist and worker parties can be the only organizers of the process of rapprochement among socialist countries. Only the Marxist-Leninist vanguards of the working class and of all working people can determine the directions of this process and its specific pace and type consistent with the requirements of each interested country and the extent of its readiness to engage in one or another way and means of cooperation.

Our party is actively assisting in the unification of socialist countries on the basis of true equality. The regular meetings between Comrade L. I. Brezhnev and other CPSU leaders with party and government leaders of the socialist countries, taking place under circumstances marked by profound reciprocal trust, comradely principle-mindedness and efficiency, provide a powerful impulse to the systematic strengthening of the friendship and cooperation among fraternal countries. Such multilateral and bilateral meetings are one of the important confirmations of the intensification of the party principle in the process of the all-round rapprochement among fraternal peoples.

Naturally, the objective process of rapprochement does not turn the socialist countries into some kind of closed group. On the contrary, it presumes the extensive development of their comprehensive relations with other countries and active participation in all realms of international life, as well as exerting ever-greater influence on the progressive changes in the nature of international relations throughout the world. Many of their initiatives are aimed at radically improving international circumstances, promoting a policy of peaceful coexistence, and developing economic and scientific and technical relations with all countries showing their desire to cooperate.

Life has confirmed the correctness of the theoretical conclusion drawn by the communist and worker parties on the objective nature of the gradual rapprochement among socialist countries and the fruitfulness of their practical course directed toward the implementation of this law. The process of rapprochement helps the fraternal countries to develop successfully their economies, national cultures, and statehood. It intensifies the overall power and influence of socialism on the course of world events. The experience of their reciprocal relations is becoming an important factor in friendly contacts among all peoples of the world.

The gradual rapprochement among socialist countries is one of the main directions in the development of the new socioeconomic system. However, many historical stages must be covered and difficulties surmounted on the long way to the higher phase of the communist society, on an international scale. Yet, a great deal has already been accomplished. The transition from laying the foundations of all-round cooperation among socialist countries to its mature and stable forms is taking place successfully.

The unity and solidarity among socialist countries will be intensified with the strengthening of the internationalization of the economic and spiritual life of the fraternal countries, the growth of common elements, and the equalization of development levels. Unquestionably, this will accelerate the progress of each of them toward a world socialist comity as a whole. It will increase the attractiveness of its example and its role in resolving the main problems of our time--the problems of the struggle for peace, democracy, and all-round social progress.

5003

CSO: 1802

PARTY CONCERN FOR QUALITY

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 5, Mar 77 pp 32-40

[Article by T. Arkhipova, first secretary, Oktyabr'skiy Rayon party committee, Moscow]

[Text] Our country has entered the great 60th anniversary of the Great October Revolution. We remember V. I. Lenin's precept that the best way to celebrate the anniversary of the Great Revolution is to direct the attention on unresolved problems. Celebrating the anniversary of the socialist fatherland, the party organization of Oktyabr'skiy Rayon, Moscow city, is mobilizing the working people for the solution of the socioeconomic problems formulated at the 25th CPSU Congress, the October 1976 Central Committee Plenum, and the outstanding speech by Comrade L. I. Brezhnev delivered at that plenum. The rayon party members are paying particular attention to upgrading production effectiveness and quality. The working people in industry, the scientific institutions, and state organizations have focused their efforts along this most important direction. I recall the lectures given by heads and chief specialists of the USSR Council of Ministers State Committee for Standards at Oktyabr'skiy Rayon factories and plants. It was a question of achieving high quality, possible only by strictly observing standards which play a decisive role in upgrading the technical level of goods. They spoke of a system of metric measures, microns, milligrams, and seconds. This was an exciting discussion which left no one who was present indifferent. This was because the rayon party committee and the primary organizations which made the preparations for this mass visit of big specialists to labor collectives tried to focus the talks on the personal responsibility of the people for the implementation of the work.

Here again we should point out that the working people in our rayon are particularly aware of this responsibility, for Oktyabr'skiy Rayon accounts for 20 percent of the mounting of automated machine tool lines produced in the country. One out of three machinists in the country uses a machine tool with the label of our machine tool building plant Krasnyy Proletariy imeni A. I. Yefremov. This significant role played by the goods produced

by the rayon enterprises for industry creates a particularly high feeling of duty. That is why our party organization considers the problem of quality not only in terms of purely technical but moral aspects. We consider this a complex problem, for quality is the result of a number of components: material and technical conditions, professional cadre training, the moral and psychological climate in the collective, and worker conscientiousness. That is why we are involved in the organization of measures aimed at upgrading the technical standard of not only the industrial-transportation department of the raykom but the departments dealing with science, higher educational institutions, propaganda and agitation, and organizational-party work.

Planning forms of party influence on upgrading production quality we rely on the rich experience of the Moscow City Party Organization, and the rayon's party organizations. This experience indicates that the more extensively are the workers and the public involved in the struggle for quality the greater are its results. Thus, based on the results of the first public review, the rayon enterprises terminated the production of about 150 types of obsolete items.

The need for the establishment of a public institute which would provide methodical and practical aid to enterprise managers and specialists on matters of quality became obvious in the course of the review. To this effect the rayon party committee set up a quality commission which included leading specialists in various industrial sectors, personnel of scientific research institutes, high officials of the USSR Gosstandart, representatives of primary organizations in plants and factories, and leading production workers and innovators.

Studying comprehensively and constantly the state of affairs at enterprises, the commission elaborated knowledgeable recommendations on the application of a system for quality control and for strengthening the quality control apparatus. Together with the industrial-transportation department of the raykom, the commission sponsors seminars for secretaries of party organizations, enterprise chief specialists, and the personnel of metrological services to exchange experience in the organization of the socialist competition for high quality and production certification.

Studying possibilities for improving quality, together with the science and VUZ council of the rayon party committee, the commission involved in the solution of problems of upgrading the technical standard of output the party members of scientific research institutes, the more so since Oktyabr'skiy Rayon includes some 100 sectorial and academic scientific institutions. The strengthening of ties between science and production became one of the most important directions in our work. Today the rayon party committee is supervising the annual plans for joint measures by collectives of industrial enterprises and scientific establishments.

In accordance with such a plan the machine-building plant imeni S. Ordzhonikidze concluded contracts for creative cooperation with six scientific research institutes. Such creative cooperation is yielding tremendous practical results. The cooperation between the plant workers and the personnel of the specialized design bureau for automated lines and aggregated machine tools, based on a competition contract, is an example of the collective search for ways to upgrade the technical standards of produced equipment and, on this basis, increasing the economic effectiveness of its utilization in industry. The creation of more productive machine tools and automated lines will be the result of joint work. In the 10th Five-Year Plan these items will be able to upgrade an effectiveness equal to the conventional release of 25,000 enterprise workers, or savings totaling 60 million rubles.

The collectives of the plant and the specialized design bureau are linked by long creative cooperation. The new contract for joint work represents a higher stage of competition. The investigation of the implementation of joint obligations and the discussion of ripe problems take place at joint sessions of the plant's party committee and the party committee of the special design bureau, as well as at conferences of the party and economic activists of the two collectives. At the present time the party organizations of shops and sections, and even party groups frequently resolve jointly vital production and design problems.

The creative cooperation between the Krasnyy Oktyabr' pastry factory and the USSR Academy of Sciences Institute of Physical Chemistry, between the carburetors plant and the Institute of Steels and Alloys, as well as cooperation between other organizations are yielding considerable results.

It was emphasized at the 25th party congress that we must consider the problem of quality as a structural part of the great effort to upgrade production effectiveness. The party organizations link problems of quality improvement with the major reconstruction of 12 leading rayon enterprises. Characteristic in this respect are the basic directions followed by the party organization of the Krasnyy Proletariy Plant. This collective is famous throughout the country. It was here that, in the first five-year plans, the famous DIP lathes were developed, with which many enterprises were equipped at that time. Today as well machine tools created by the collective of this great enterprise are at work in various plants throughout the country. The scientific and technical revolution made radical changes in the life of the oldest machine tool building plant.

There are periods in the life of any production collective in which the symptoms of "growing pains" are manifested tangibly. Their surmounting requires maximal efforts. Such a difficult year in the life of the Krasnyy Proletariy Plant was the one related to conversion to the production of a qualitatively new model of machine tools. The plant was feverish. This could not fail to alarm the rayon party organization. The rayon party committee bureau studied the situation at Krasnyy Proletariy and reached

the conclusion that the reason for the failures was the weakened attention which the party committee paid to the placement and upbringing of production leaders. The economic managers were criticized sharply. Some of them, used to conditions which had developed over a number of years, were confused by the new tasks. Others simply lacked adequate knowledge for their implementation.

The plant's party committee drew proper conclusions from the criticism. The basic attention was focused on the cadres. Skilled specialists--party members--capable of making operative decisions and seeing beyond the present needs of the production process, were appointed to head the most responsible sectors. Those who fell behind, including leading specialists, shop chiefs, and foremen, were replaced.

Every manager was issued specific assignments and efficient control over their implementation was organized. This contributed to the development of creative searches and to developing a feeling of responsibility for assignments. The party committee saw to it that each party meeting took place under circumstances of high reciprocal party member exactingness. I recall a meeting at the first machine shop at which the party members, having studied the work at each sector, established the specific reasons for faulty output and violation of technical conditions. The shop management which failed to pay the necessary attention to the application of the system of faultless manufacturing, was criticized. In the same way the members of all shop party organizations and party groups exposed shortcomings in the work and sought and found unused reserves.

The efficient deployment of forces and increased cadre exactingness contributed to the creation and mastering, within a short time, of the new 16K20 model of a screw-cutting lathe. Without resting on its accomplishments, the party organization began to prepare the collective for the next important step--raising the new model to the level of the best world standards. In this connection the party committee deemed it necessary to pay even greater attention to the development in every worker of a feeling of responsibility and pride in the Krasnyy Proletariy label. A labor glory museum was solemnly inaugurated at the enterprise. It became an educational center. Meetings between young people and plant veterans who described to their young comrades the legendary years of the first five-year plans, and the contribution of the Krasnyy Proletariy workers to the tremendous project of the industrialization of the country, were systematically promoted in shops and departments.

The party organization conducted extensive mass and individual work in the collective, aimed at upgrading technical production standards. The shop party organizations and party groups acquainted the people with the principle governing the quality control system elaborated at L'vov enterprises. Its advantages were discussed at shop party and Komsomol meetings. The application of this system became possible thanks to the unity between

economic and educational work at the plant, and the comprehensive and purposeful influence exerted on practically every member of the collective, worker or enterprise manager.

The party raykom did not lower its attention to the work of its biggest primary organization at such an important stage in its activities. The preparations for granting the new lathe the high quality category was checked every month by the rayon quality commission. The raykom bureau constantly studied the state of affairs. This included the holding of a special session at the enterprise itself. These efforts resulted in the long-awaited success: the lathe was granted the Emblem of Quality by the state commission. The CPSU Central Committee and USSR Council of Ministers congratulated the workers for their great labor victory--mastering of the complex-mechanized assembly line production of new highly productive machine tools. The fact that now the quality control system at the Krasnyy Proletariy Plant has assumed solid positions is, above all, the result of intensive work done by the primary party organization which was able to mobilize the collective under difficult circumstances.

Today as well, developing its great traditions under the leadership of its party organization, the Krasnyy Proletariy collective is planning to reach higher levels. Recently the Krasnyy Proletariy workers reported to Comrade L. I. Brezhnev that "Our collective, adamantly mobilizing new reserves for improving produced equipment, is working under the slogan of 'A Five-Year Plan of Effectiveness and Quality and First Grade Equipment.' We have undertaken the radical reconstruction of the entire production process and a decisive conversion to the mass manufacturing of the most productive equipment yielding maximal national economic effectiveness. By the end of the five-year plan the share of this equipment in the overall output will quintuple and reach the 80 percent level. The manufacturing of modern machine tools with digital programing, each of which can replace two or three general purpose machine tools, will be almost doubled. The productivity of multiple-spindle semiautomatic machines equipped with highly effective technological accessories will triple. The production of specialized lathes equipped with duplicating supports, screwing attachments, facilities for the mechanization of auxiliary operations, and electronic control systems and other attachments will quintuple. This will considerably upgrade productivity and expand the technological possibilities of such lathes." In his greetings to the Krasnyy Proletariy workers, Comrade L. I. Brezhnev noted that "Your patriotic initiative, expressed in the clear and understandable slogan of 'First Class Equipment in the Five-Year Plan of Effectiveness and Quality' reflects the essence of the main task facing machine tool building and the entire machine-building industry in the new stage of the building of communism. The accelerated supply of all economic sectors with modern progressive equipment is the most important lever insuring a considerable growth of social production effectiveness and the solution of social problems related to further improvements in the working conditions of millions of Soviet people and of upgrading the

prosperity of our people...I am confident that you will successfully fulfill your obligations for 1977 and the entire five-year plan on upgrading production effectiveness and work quality and that your initiative concerning the creation of the most progressive equipment, worthy of the greatness of our historical tasks, will meet with the universal support of millions of Soviet machine-builders."

The strictly technical problems of upgrading quality called for improving the work with cadres and for restructuring them mentally. Today a great deal is being done in this direction by the council of directors set up by the raykom, which sums up and disseminates acquired experience. The activities of this institution, which was given recommendation functions, turned out to be quite effective. The psychological aspect plays a great role here. The directors of enterprises located on rayon territory zealously see the way the work of their collectives is rated. Should the council discuss problems of increased capital returns or, for example, of increasing the shift coefficient at enterprises, illustrating this with figures and diagrams, no one remains indifferent. The managers come out of such sessions enriched with new and valuable knowledge on the art of management. As a rule, we sponsor such sessions at enterprises where something could be learned.

Practical experience shows that this progressive experience is developed most fruitfully in collectives whose primary party organizations actively implement their right to control the economic activities of administrations, try to analyze the situation more profoundly, and support initiatives.

Thus, struggling for improving quality and effectiveness, the party members of the carburetors plant undertook a major reorganization of the production process. New capacities were installed. The party members found ways for mastering them most effectively. Naturally, they could have waited for the construction workers to deliver the finished plant and only then install and launch the equipment. It was also possible, however, literally to follow behind the construction workers. This question was discussed at party committee sessions and party meetings. In the final account, it was decided not to wait for the completion of the construction work. Finishing workers and assemblymen were still working in the building while finished goods were already being produced in the completed areas. The installation of the equipment was conducted strictly according to a plan jointly elaborated by the administration and the party organization. The commissions controlling administrative activities strictly supervised its implementation.

The achieved success was due to the excellent reciprocal understanding between the party organization and the administration. For many years the party committee tirelessly worked with the reserve of leading cadres, focusing the attention on political literacy, and the moral qualities and enhancement of business qualifications of the specialists. Therefore, when a new detachment of production leaders became needed it was organized rapidly.

People who had worked for several years as first deputy managers of respective services were given key positions in the first production building. For example, the deputy plant director was appointed chief of the building; the deputy chief mechanic of the enterprise was appointed chief mechanic, and so on. All specialists have higher specialized training.

The question of backing the production process with foremen, tuners, and skilled workers was no less grave. Matters were complicated by "geography." The new building was in Chertanovo--15km away from the main complex. The cadre workers lived far from Chertanovo and they found it difficult to travel to the new place of work. The ability of the party organization to look into the future made the solution of this problem as well possible. Allocating areas for the building of residential housing, the party committee and the management gave priority to Chertanovo. Thus, the moment the production process was launched, the nucleus of the collective had already moved to the new area. The result of the purposeful work by the party organization was the fact that the plant workers reached production capacity one year sooner.

The party raykom ascribes to control over implementation of decisions great importance in its work with the primary organizations. An efficient system for such control developed through the activities of the party committee of the Experimental Scientific Research Institute of Metal-Cutting Machines, and the Stankokonstruktsiya experimental plant. As a rule, control of execution is exercised here at the decision-making stage. In its decrees the party committee clearly formulates the basic directions, indicates deadlines for the implementation of respective measures, and names the party members responsible for the implementation of such measures. These party members mandatorily participate in the discussion of problems. This makes possible a deeper elaboration of problems and increases personal responsibility for the implementation of decisions.

Party control is focused on the most important central directions. This enables the primary organization to block shortcomings and possible failures on time. Such was the case when the collective was given a responsible assignment regarding new equipment. After thorough preparations the party committee passed the decree "On the Work of the Party Organization and the Administration in Mobilizing the Collective for the Implementation of Assignments on the Development of the AP-1 Automated Production Facility." The commission in charge of controlling administrative activities focused its attention on its implementation. On two occasions the party committee heard reports submitted by economic managers, party activists, and immediate performers. Thanks to the persistence and purposeful activities of the party organization and the administration, the automated production facility began its experimental-industrial operations ahead of schedule. The raykom bureau approved the experience of the party committee of the institute and the plant and recommended it to all other rayon primary organizations.

Today, using its acquired experience and a variety of ways and means of work, the rayon party organization works for the development at plants and factories of a system of organizational, technical, economic, and political-educational measures aimed at steadily upgrading the quality of output. The rayon party bureau discussed the work of the party organization of the carburetors plant on developing an intraplant certification of output, and of the party committee of the state bearings plant number two on managing the socialist competition for the quality of output. The enterprises are also developing the practice of holding scientific-production quality conferences with the participation of consumers and suppliers.

The decree of the CPSU Central Committee, USSR Council of Ministers, AUCCTU, and Komsomol Central Committee on the all-union socialist competition for upgrading production effectiveness and work quality triggered a new upsurge in the labor and political activeness of all rayon collectives. We are striving to improve our work even further in the organization of a mass labor competition for raising the technical standard of the goods. The task of improving quality could be implemented successfully if every working person becomes aware of the personal contribution he could make to this important matter. The raykom and the enterprise party committees frequently invite senior ministry and departmental workers, major scientists, and innovators to meet with enterprise collectives and discuss with them means for technical improvements of output. The party raykom organized a quality university. All this contributes to the creative development of initiative. The noteworthy competition under the slogan of "Worker Guarantee for a Quality Five-Year Plan!" became widespread among industrial enterprises. Currently it involves the participation of over 200 brigades, and over 3,500 plant and factory workers. Aware of the fact that many reserves remain unused, the raykom bureau considered the question of organizational and mass political work for the dissemination of labor initiatives aimed at upgrading production effectiveness and quality of output in the light of the decisions of the 25th Communist Party Congress.

The struggle for improving the quality of output became the nucleus of the work of all primary organizations. A creative atmosphere has been established in most of the leading rayon enterprises. Every worker has formulated his objectives and landmarks. Noteworthy are the individual pledges for the production of excellent quality goods of the workers at the Stankokonstruktsiya plant. The labor record of party member A. Shustov, assemblyman at the assembly shop, states the following: take a course in industrial electronics, master the digital program control system, and learn how to adjust the electronic drive. The individual creative plan of party member V. Yerin, assembly shop chief, states the following: train the workers in a course for progressive labor methods how to assemble with high-level accuracy; prepare for and implement measures insuring the plant's certification of two items. The obligations of individual workers become part of the overall objectives of the collectives. A decision passed at a party meeting of that same assembly shop called for training 20 skilled workers in a

progressive labor method course in mastering industrial electronics and train fitters in the assembly of precision machine tools; produce monthly 80 percent of superior quality goods and prepare, together with other plant subdivisions, six items for certification; hold a public review of work areas, and modernize benches and equipment.

Plans are formulated for improving the quality of the goods with the participation of entire collectives. The party organizations which were able to awaken and develop this initiative directed into the channel of an efficient organizational system which combines individual searches with the interests of the state. In answer to the decisions of the 25th party congress, on the initiative of the party members, a valuable initiative was developed at the Krasnyy Proletariy, imeni S. Ordzhonikidze, and Stankokonstruktsiya plants, and the Krasnyy Oktyabr' factory: the formulation, together with scientific research institutes, of comprehensive plans for upgrading production quality in the 10th Five-Year Plan. The emphasis was placed on the elaboration and introduction of a comprehensive quality control system, and the launching of widespread socialist competition for the production of superior quality goods. The rayon party committee saw this as a powerful lever for party influence on improving the quality of all work. The raykom bureau brought together the secretaries of the biggest industrial enterprises, the council of directors, the rayon quality commission, and the council for science and VUZ's to discuss the set of organizational, technical, and social measures which would insure the dissemination of this valuable initiative. The question of the tasks of the rayon party organization in upgrading the technical standard and quality of output in the light of the decisions of the 25th CPSU Congress was submitted for discussion at a plenum. Currently all rayon enterprises are supporting the initiative of the elaboration of comprehensive plans for improving production quality. This enabled the rayon party committee to formulate a consolidated plan for party measures aimed at upgrading the quality of output in the 10th Five-Year Plan.

For the rayon as a whole the five-year quality upgrading plan calls for mastering in the 10th Five-Year Plan the production of about 360 types of new commodities, terminating the production of over 290 types of obsolete items, submitting 250 items for state Emblem of Quality certification, and increasing the share of superior category goods 100 percent. Formulating this consolidated plan we were guided by the stipulation of the CPSU Central Committee Accountability Report to the 25th party congress. "We conceive of the quality problem in very broad terms," Comrade L. I. Brezhnev said. "It covers all aspects of economic activity. High quality means saving on labor and material resources, increased export possibilities, and, in the final account, better and fuller satisfaction of social requirements. That is why the entire planning and management mechanism, the entire system of material and moral incentives, the efforts of engineers and designers, and the skill of the workers must be focused on upgrading production quality. This must be the constant focal point of attention of the party organizations, the trade unions, and the Komsomol."

On the basis of the suggestions submitted by the primary organizations, the rayon party committee included in its five-year plan a set of measures aimed at upgrading the technical level of the goods and their reliability and durability. In particular, the raykom is exercising strict party control over the technical retooling and reconstruction of enterprises: the installation of new production capacities at the Krasnyy Proletariy, imeni S. Ordzhonikidze, Stankonormal', and GPZ-2 plants, and the Udarnitsa factory. About 2,400 new equipment units will be installed in the rayon's enterprises and almost 160 new technological processes will be applied. The rayon committee focuses its attention on the cadre problem. Over 60,000 workers, foremen, and engineers will undergo training in the course of the five-year plan.

This five-year plan is a good guideline in party work. To begin with, it is an efficient program for action for the party members, establishing the levels to be reached on an annual basis. Secondly, it is an instrument for control by the rayon party committee and all primary organizations over the implementation of the program. Thirdly, the plan calls for the possibility to study measures aimed at cadre training and retraining, the growth rates of faultless output, the dissemination of progressive experience, the activities of quality courses, and so on. This is important also because occasionally the enterprises adopt an averaged approach to the determination of quantitative and qualitative indicators.

In the very first year of the new five-year plan 59 types of items produced by our enterprises earned the state Emblem of Quality. As a result the share of superior category goods has reached 19 percent. The Moscow City Party Committee Bureau approved the experience of our rayon party organization in upgrading the quality of output. The city party committee held a seminar in the rayon at which secretaries and heads of industrial-transportation departments of CPSU raykoms as well as party committee secretaries of big industrial enterprises studied the practical experience of our party organizations in accelerating the mastering of production facilities and increasing the percentage of superior quality goods. However, we realize that all such accomplishments are merely the beginning of a radical improvement of the quality of output.

"Effectiveness and quality are the key task of the 10th Five-Year Plan," said Comrade L. I. Brezhnev in his recent speech to the 16th USSR Trade Unions Congress. "However, we should not forget that this concise and precise formula must not become a routine sentence and lose its active and mobilizing nature. One must check oneself zealously everyday: are we doing everything possible for its implementation?" This exacting question is asked of themselves by the party members and all working people in our rayon in adopting higher obligations, formulating counterplans, and discussing at meetings problems of improving quality and upgrading production effectiveness.

Many unresolved problems lie ahead. However, the rayon party organization is confident that the working people, headed by the party members, will deal with them successfully. The words of Comrade L. I. Brezhnev that the initiative of the Krasnyy Proletariy in the development of the most progressive equipment will meet with mass support is now confirmed by reality. The collectives of the plants imeni S. Ordzhonikidze, GPZ-2, for carburetors, and Stankokonstruktsiya and, with them, the working people of the other rayon enterprises, have assumed new obligations which will contribute to upgrading the quality and effectiveness of output.

The rayon party organization will dedicate all its forces, knowledge, and experience to the implementation of the decisions of the 25th party congress and will do everything possible to fulfill successfully the 10th Five-Year Plan--the five-year plan of effectiveness and quality--for the sake of the power of our homeland and the further growth of the people's prosperity.

5003

CSO: 1802

BRIGADE CONTRACTING IN MACHINE BUILDING

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 5, Mar 77 pp 41-49

[Article by L. Poklonskiy, complex brigade leader, Promsvyaz' imeni XXV S"yezda KPSS Union Plant in Akhtyrka, delegate to the 16th USSR Trade Unions Congress, Akhtyrka, Sumsкая Oblast]

[Text] During the Ninth Five-Year Plan the collectives of many enterprises gained valuable experience in the struggle for upgrading production effectiveness. Summing up this experience, the 25th CPSU Congress formulated the main directions which determine it. One of them is improving the end national economic results consisting of the end results of the activities of production collectives.

As we know, each item produced by associations, plants, and factories undergoes intermediary technological semifinishing, processing, and assembling stages. The economic results are determined on the basis of the final product and its quantity and quality. Naturally, however, one should not think that the end results of enterprise activities depend only on the work of fitters-assemblers.

In the past, it frequently happened at our Promsvyaz' Plant that the production of finished goods was delayed should lathe or milling workers fail to supply the assemblers with the necessary amount of parts or should they receive parts of substandard quality. Meanwhile, mountains of parts occasionally rose for assembling yet no commodities could be produced because of missing parts. At the end of the month it looked as though the workers would have no reasons for discontent: everyone had earned well and everyone had not only fulfilled but, occasionally, considerably overfulfilled the norm. Everyone was content and frequently failed to consider the fact that the economic effect achieved at the different intermediary stages was frequently lost instead of being expressed in the end results of the plant's activities. This shortcoming in the organization of the production and labor process is inherent, in one or another way or scale, in a number of machine-building enterprises.

Yet, at the present time the labor of the workers on the scale of the entire national economy and of associations, plants, and factories is becoming ever-more specialized. To an ever-greater extent the end results of the work depend on a number of intermediary links and on increasingly complex intra-shop and intershop relations. "Under such circumstances," noted Comrade L. I. Brezhnev, CPSU Central Committee general secretary, addressing the 25th party congress, "in pursuit of intermediary results which, in themselves, do not provide a solution, it is easy to omit the main thing: end results. Conversely, failing to pay the necessary attention to any intermediary link, one could undermine the final, the overall effect of substantial efforts and investments."

The brigade contracting system in construction work, applied by N. A. Zlobin, rapidly earned universal recognition by virtue of its high effectiveness among the many outstanding initiatives which have become part of the treasury of progressive experience.

A search for the same type of method which would enable them to organize collective labor most effectively was conducted at machine-building enterprises as well. The contemporary production process demands of every worker to be clearly aware of his position in the labor process, to know what he is doing and why, and what depends on him. He must feel that his labor is a necessary part of the common work. Labor and wages must be organized in such a way that the worker be interested not only in fulfilling his personal assignment but in the achievement of best final results as well.

Together with my comrades I am proud that it was precisely the Promsvyaz' Plant that initiated this method. Our task was complex, for construction workers deal with a single project--a building--and it is easier for them to estimate and plan their work from beginning to end. Our situation is different: we are producing about 250 different types of items for communications, ranging from small apparatus to big machines whose haulage requires several flatcars. Understandably, there are more people directly engaged in the plant in the manufacturing of such items. Furthermore, here technology changes faster than in a construction brigade. All this created specific problems.

The beginning was small. In the past, every machine tool worker in the shop worked individually. Processing a part he carried out several operations, for which reason he changed tools frequently. This was an unproductive time loss. In 1971 I suggested to five lathe workers of different grades to undertake the processing of parts by operation, becoming members of a single brigade and receiving a single assignment, while distributing wages in accordance with the grade and time worked. Initially the "elders" expressed doubts: would the end result be that they would be working for the novices? Nevertheless, they decided to try it. It turned out that the breakdown of the work by operation suited everyone. Yesterday's students began to fulfill simple operations--roughing out, grinding, and turning

out--while the highly skilled lathe workers did the more complex work. As a result, the skills and abilities of each were used to the fullest extent. The output of parts increased, the percentage of faulty output declined, and everyone earned more.

Three months later, our example was followed by other lathe workers, grinders, and millers. Six brigades were set up at the machine shop, each of them working on a single assignment. We began to compete. The plant committee set up a pennant for us awarded to the best collective. The work seemed to be going along well. However, a certain lack of coordination in the work remained (true, now it was among brigades). Either the lathe worker brigade leaders would undertake to determine how equitably the parts for processing were distributed, or the grinders would fail to supply items on time, or else the milling workers fell behind in their deliveries.

As we know, the development of a united collective and of relations of mutual aid and reciprocal exactingness is a lengthy process. The brigades were staffed by different type people. In order to rally them a common highly attractive objective was needed along with a wage system which would insure to the greatest extent the harmony between individual and social interests.

The idea originated of expanding the brigade by including in it all workers engaged in implementing a set of operations for the mechanical processing of parts. The party and plant committees supported the suggestion. I was asked to head the consolidated brigade. A better organization of the work, further division of operations, efficient loading of the machine tools, and the increased skills of the workers enabled our collective to increase its output drastically. Labor productivity rose 15 percent. As a result we began to earn both progressively higher wages and wage supplements for high production quality.

We worked thus for about one year. Close contacts developed within the brigade along with comradely mutual aid and support. Reciprocal exactingness rose. At that time socialist competition for increased economic effectiveness of output developed extensively in the plant. Our common objective was to produce more goods of better quality and with lesser outlays. Here again, we were able to see, yet once again, the extent to which successes in the work of each primary collective depend on the activities of all brigades. The assemblymen could achieve high results only if processing workers would supply them on time with the necessary parts manufactured above the plan. On the other hand, we too depended on the assemblymen, for should they fail to assemble the finished products out of above plan parts, effectiveness would decline rather than increase, for the cost of unfinished production would rise and capital would be frozen.

Gradually, many workers began to reach the conclusion that the best coordination in the work could be achieved only by working within a single brigade and a single assignment. I consulted processing and assembly workers and sent a letter to the party committee. I suggested the organization of a complex brigade which would include 75 people--the personnel of the entire technological cycle making reduction gear, cable layers, and transportation workers. A single assignment would be issued to the brigade and a single monthly production task. In a word, the suggestion was to rally all of them for the common objective of insuring the manufacturing of finished products.

The suggestion was supported by the administration, and the party and trade union committees. However, it had opponents as well. For example, the then chief of shop was categorically opposed to the creation of a complex brigade. In the course of our discussion he said: "This is a useless plan, Poklonskiy. They will give you one, two, or three months to fulfill the plan and then you will wreck it. You will hurt both of us." These words saddened me, for he was not alone to think so. Skeptical voices were heard when the letter was discussed in the shop at a general meeting. Some highly skilled workers had become used to relying only on themselves, assuming that they would always earn as much as they wanted by themselves. It was also said that, essentially, it would be difficult to manage such a brigade. It was believed that the optimal size should be 25 to 30 people whereas this one would have 75. Could the brigade leader manage such a big collective and implement the functions of production organizer and educator? At that meeting I had to speak out twice. I proved that it was precisely the brigade contracting method, based on cost accounting, that will interest directly the workers to work quickly, qualitatively, and economically. I cited estimates showing that labor productivity and earnings would increase: everything would depend on our level of organization, on how well we work, on how thriftily we use materials, capital assets, and energy, and lower labor intensiveness. As to managing, in no case should a brigade leader act alone. He should be helped by the entire collective. I was supported by the majority.

Since we intended to assume responsibility for the entire set of operations, beginning with preparations and ending with the delivery of finished products to the technical control department, the complex brigade had to sign a contract with the plant's administration. Whereas the plans drawn up by ministries, main administrations, associations, and even plants may sometimes include certain stipulations (whenever it is unclear as to whether or not technical documentation will be received on time, material and technical resources will be delivered, performance deadlines would be changed, and so on), no such stipulations are allowed in the work plan of a contracting brigade. The plan must be particularly specific.

It was on this basis that the plant formulated our volume of work, established production or time norms, and planned deliveries of materials and tools. The entire technological equipment needed for the manufacturing of the items was assigned to the brigade.

The brigade signed a contract with the administration for the entire year (with quarterly and monthly breakdowns). It undertook to carry out the stipulated operations on the basis of a closed cycle of the technological process for the production of the assigned items (with the exception of semifinishing and galvanizing operations carried out at other shops), in accordance with blueprints, technical stipulations, and labor safety rules, within specific deadlines as earmarked in charts and assumed socialist obligations. In turn, the administration guaranteed us material and technical backing. It pledged to pay the brigade a 10 percent bonus based on the piece rate payments in the faultless delivery of the entire output to the technical control department with another 10 percent for the ahead-of-schedule implementation of the entire variety plan. In the course of the first six months we would also be paid 50 percent of the amount saved as a result of a revision of output norms initiated by workers.

The next stage was to improve labor and wage accounting. We decided to issue a single assignment for each separate commodity indicating only the overall time norm for its manufacturing and the fixed payment rate (in the past all machine tool workers had separate assignments for each part). The wages were distributed among brigade members on the basis of end results in accordance with their grade and amount of time worked.

Such an organization of the work and wages eliminated the classification of operations into "profitable" and "unprofitable," since all workers were interested in the output of finished products. Even though the brigade was divided into three teams (one of lathe workers and two of assemblymen), it is a single labor collective with a single management, whose members work jointly and know one another.

Naturally, the establishment of a united collective in such a big primary subdivision was considerably more difficult than in the old brigade. The party members displayed great concern for the creation of a good micro-climate, of an atmosphere of reciprocal well-wishing and exactingness. For the first time in the plant's history a separate party group was set up in the brigade (previously there were section party groups), which headed ideological and educational work, steadily explaining the party's economic policy as organically linked with the specific tasks facing the collective. The party members did not hope that the understanding of the advantages of brigade contracting work would come by themselves. They purposefully molded public opinion, feeding it into the necessary channel--toward upgrading individual and social responsibility for end work results. In a word, the party group focused its efforts on enabling every working person directly engaged in the production of material values to display a truly statesmanlike interest in his obligations, clearly realizing the levels to be reached, aware of future developments, and willing to increase the effectiveness and quality of his work. Giving the example of a communist attitude toward labor and high exactingness toward themselves, the party members were the pioneers in the socialist competition which was organized

among us following the method of Moscow's Dinamo Plant. Studying the implementation of assignments, the quality of manufactured parts and the assembling of items, the condition of the labor discipline, production standards, and attitude toward the work, the party group initiated a number of measures aimed at improving end production results. It supported through its authority those who assumed a principled position in the struggle for strengthening the labor discipline. It adamantly saw to it that no one fell behind. It was able to find an individual approach to everyone and to issue party assignments. Involving the brigade members in social work and party training, the party group displayed concern for the growth of its ranks. It selected and prepared for party membership the best leading production workers. Anticipating, let me point out that in the past two years the party group in the brigade was enlarged by yet another five workers. The party members were placed in such a way as to be found in all brigade subdivisions. Thus, previously, the team of reduction gear assemblymen and transportation had only one party member. Now it has three and Yu. A. Nesterenko, the team leader himself, is a party member. Among the lathe workers 6 of the 31 members are members of the CPSU; 6 of the 22 members of the fitters assembling cable layers are party members. All in all, 20 percent of the complex brigade members are communists.

It was precisely on the initiative of the party group that a brigade council was set up to resolve all the most important problems affecting the life of the collective. It sums up on a weekly basis the results of the fulfillment of the plan and socialist pledges by the individual workers and the entire brigade. It submits proposals to the administration on awarding bonuses and rewards to distinguished workers, on raising their grades or on imposing penalties for various violations. The council is the collective authority set up for self-administration. It strengthens considerably labor and production discipline, assists in the training and education of the workers, disseminates the experience of the best among them, and helps rationalizers. This way unity between political and economic management, aimed at upgrading production effectiveness, is directly manifested in the complex brigade.

Our complex brigade received the contract on 1 August 1973. Two months later a similar brigade was set up in the shop, headed by V. A. Biryukov (120 people); a third brigade was then created headed by P. N. Yesin, rallying the workers of different shops (it was the first to operate on a multiple-shop basis).

We were pleased with the 1974 work results. As a result of the further division of technological operations into simple and complex, and the efficient use of the possibilities of workers with different skill levels, the drastic lowering of time losses and idling, and increased labor rhythm at the machine section and assembly shop, output of reduction gear rose 90 percent; of cable layers, 63 percent; and of narrow band transporters, 57 percent. Production of spare parts rose 2.5 times.

In one year labor productivity in our brigade rose 21.2 percent while the volume of output rose 40.3 percent. In addition to our assignments we produced for the rural workers under our sponsorship 50 scraper-chain conveyers, and 15 concentrated fodder feeders (essentially from economized materials). On the suggestion of the workers the plant's administration increased the output norms for some operations. As a result of this, in one year labor outlays were reduced by 45,000 norm/hours. One half of the funds thus released were placed by the administration at the disposal of the brigade council which used it to grant bonuses to lathe and assembly workers who had distinguished themselves in the individual competition. We carried out the assignment while releasing another five people. Man-power losses in the collective declined substantially; absenteeism disappeared, materials and instruments were strictly accounted for. The number of assignments issued for intermediary operations declined sharply. Instead of 18,000 per year they were reduced to no more than 100-120. The overall savings from the use of the brigade contracting method totaled 100,000 rubles. In the complex brigade headed by V. A. Biryukov the volume of output rose 17.2 percent and labor productivity, 16.9 percent; the respective figures for P. N. Yesin's brigade were 10.9 and 10.3 percent.

Therefore, as our experience proved, the brigade contracting method could yield considerable economic and social results in machine building as well. It raises to a new level the feeling of comradeship and collectivism, while the clarity and commonness of objectives trigger in every brigade member a direct interest in increasing labor productivity, lowering faulty production, and an aspiration toward constant creativity and the search for reserves. It is important to emphasize that such an incentive is not separate or strictly individual but collective and general. That is why an atmosphere of intolerance toward violators of technological and labor discipline has been created in the shop; the area of application of means of coercion is becoming ever-smaller while that of ideological influence, and persuasion is expanding respectively; tutorship traditions are developing energetically.

Turnover has been practically eliminated in our brigade. In the past three years 10 people were drafted in the Soviet Army; 3 became students while 3 others moved away. A certain cadre movement is taking place in the other brigades as well. Young people are coming to the plant. Should such novices work individually, the process of their consolidation within the collectives, as practical experience shows, is lengthy, ranging from 6 to 18 months. Failing occasionally to receive timely assistance from their elders, they are slow in acquiring production skills and their wages frequently do not exceed 60 to 70 rubles. As a result of this some of them become disappointed in their work and leave. Things in the complex brigades are different. A first grade worker begins with a salary of 110 to 120 rubles. The collective pays him a wage supplement as though in advance. Therefore, everyone in the brigade is not only morally but materially interested in helping the novices to raise their grades faster and gain the necessary skills. The young workers are assigned to experienced highly

skilled specialists who voluntarily assume tutorship functions. Every month demonstration lessons in how to process complex parts or how to assemble difficult machine parts are held for the young people. This enables the novices to master the work faster: after two to five months they are already able to copewith their assignments. As a result the collective benefits from great returns from its work and education efforts, while the novices gain confidence in their forces, become accustomed to reciprocal exactingness, become involved in social life, and master related skills particularly willingly compared with the "elders."

In the very first year of work of our brigade 11 trainees earned a grade; 23 people rose in grade. Many have now mastered related skills such as work at milling, grinding, and turning mills; nearly everyone could take over from an assembly fitter. This excludes failures in the fulfillment of assignments caused by unforeseen situations. One out of two of our workers is a rationalizer. In 1974 the brigade saved over 2,000 rubles from the use of suggestions aimed at upgrading labor productivity, reducing labor intensiveness, and raw and other material savings; some 3,000 rubles were saved in 1975 and nearly as much in 1976.

Under the conditions of the brigade contracting system stricter requirements are formulated concerning the quality of the work. This presumes improvements in professional skills and general educational standards, the development of a communist outlook in the people and the promotion of a communist attitude toward labor. That is why in our shop, entirely based on the brigade contracting method, 246 people (over 70 percent of all the workers) are increasing their education and acquiring specialized knowledge. The shop party, Komsomol, and economic training systems are attended by 141 students; 15 go to night school; 8 attend technical schools; 12 attend higher educational institutions, and so on. This is precisely the category of young people who will provide in the future the best trained and initiative-minded specialists.

Over three years have passed since the creation of our complex brigade. Within that time the volume of output has risen 49.3 percent (16 percent for the plant as a whole); quality improved and labor productivity rose 40.3 percent (14 percent for the plant); wages rose 18 percent (7 percent for the plant). The brigade fulfilled its 1976 socialist pledges. A total of 20 cable layers and 185 agricultural transporters were produced above the plan. Labor intensiveness was reduced by yet another 2,624 norm/hours, as a result of which we were able to release conventionally two workers. The 1976 assignment was fulfilled ahead of schedule by 20 December and we are planning the fulfillment of the entire five-year plan in 4.5 years.

Currently seven Promsvyaz' brigades are following the brigade contracting method. They account for over 35 percent of the overall output. Their labor productivity is the highest at the plant.

Our brigade is considered the initiator of the brigade contracting method in machine building. Even though my personal contribution has been rated quite highly, the new method should not be credited to a single person. It is the result of the efforts of the entire collective. The need for such a labor organization had long become apparent. Such a progressive method could have been suggested not only by myself but by anyone in any plant, for the struggle for upgrading production effectiveness and directing the work toward end results is a demand of reality and an imperative of the times.

The 10th Five-Year Plan--the five-year plan of effectiveness and quality--faces all production collectives with major and responsible assignments. We believe that one of the effective means for their implementation is the use of the brigade contracting method in machine-building enterprises on a mass scale.

The initial steps in this direction have already been taken. The director, chief engineers, chief economists, and progressive workers of oblast plants spent seven days at Promsvyas' to study our methods of labor organization. The initiative was approved by the Sumskaya Oblast party committee, Communist Party of the Ukraine, and supported by the USSR Ministry of Communications and the Presidium of the Central Committee of the Communications Workers Trade Union. On the basis of the plant a progressive experience course was set up. Furthermore, we have been visited by over 150 delegates representing various economic sectors. Currently over 100 complex brigades in the oblast are using the contracting method in shops with complete production cycles, and at procurement and machine assembly sectors. This method was applied at the machine building plant in Belopol'ye, the Krasnyy Metallist Plant in Konotop, the Machine Building Plant imeni Frunze in Sumy, the plant for aggregated machine units in Glukhov, and others.

Yet, we cannot rely on past achievements. This experience has not been summed up as yet and recommendations for its application have not been elaborated. Naturally, this is no easy matter. This initiative cannot be automatically extended from one collective to another ignoring specific production conditions. We believe that scientists and specialists should sum up the initial results of the practical application of the brigade contracting method and help us to develop it and see future possibilities.

Naturally, we are trying ourselves to improve the brigade contracting method and intensify the stimulating role of wages based on labor and the dependence of the income of the individual worker on his individual labor contribution. We believe that certain successes have been achieved in this respect: in particular, we introduced the "labor participation co-efficients." The point is that no matter how carefully a brigade could be staffed, individual differences remain among people in terms of professional skill, work habits, and attitude toward labor obligations. The brigade contracting method does not mean equalization in the least. Therefore we have begun to distribute collective earnings not only on the basis of grade or

time worked but in accordance with such coefficients as well. Their range varies from 0.7 to 1.0; in other words, the worker may be given from 70 to 100 percent of his earnings depending on his attitude toward the work, professional skill, and complexity of the work (we have used the 0.7 coefficient only twice in the entire time). Yet, what criteria should be used to guide the brigade council in formulating such coefficients? They are largely determined intuitively. Yet, any subjectivism in this matter could trigger conflicts. Evaluation criteria for work quality are needed (in points) covering production quality, economy of raw materials and materials, and combination of skills. We expect of the scientists and specialists such recommendations.

Many hindrances remain on the path to the use of the brigade contracting method in machine building. This includes violations of plan discipline, planning errors, and inefficient work by material and technical supply services. All these errors are immediately manifested in the brigade contracting method. In our view, its successful development and mass application calls for improving planning of the contracting brigade work. The assignment should contain the volume of work, norms of output or time, number of workers by skill, amount of required materials and machine tools, equipment, and other plan-determining indicators. The plan should stipulate deadlines for the manufacturing of goods and their quality levels; it should determine the amount of bonuses for output in terms of nomenclature within the established deadline or ahead of schedule, and for saving on labor and material resources. Such an assignment should be formulated for the entire year and approved by the brigade. Should it be formulated for a single month the creative possibilities of the people would not be used fully and the people would work without perspective.

The importance of the contract should be enhanced as well. Frequently the administration does not apply penalties for its violation by the cost accounting brigade (other than deprivation of bonuses). Thus the collective is encouraged to save without being held responsible for overexpenditures. Violations of contractual obligations on the part of the administration as well are not penalized. Naturally, to a certain extent the brigades try to reduce the losses which arise in such cases. Yet, not everything depends on us. The incomplete responsibility on both sides hinders and lowers the effectiveness of the application of the new method. In machine building the brigade contracting method must exceed the boundaries of local initiative. It must become a method recognized on a nationwide scale. We believe that this would require the elaboration of a standard contract for converting the the brigade contracting method, cleared with the State Committee for Labor and Social Problems, the AUCCTU, and the ministries. This would enhance the significance of the contracting method and contribute to its more extensive dissemination.

Practical experience shows that the introduction of the brigade contracting method must be preceded by extensive preparatory work not only by the labor and wages departments but by the planning, production, and technical departments as well. We believe that the engineering and technical personnel who determine the success of this project should be paid bonuses based on a certain percentage of the overall amount allocated for worker bonuses for their active contribution to the application of effective brigade cost accounting methods. This would increase the interest of engineers and technicians and, at the same time, enhance their responsibility.

The time has come to think of the place and role of the brigade leader in the consolidated complex brigades. It is very difficult effectively to coordinate the work of 70 to 120 people and, at the same time, operate a lathe. Probably fulltime brigade leaders should be appointed to head such big subdivisions.

The conversion to the brigade contracting method should also involve a certain change in the conditions governing the socialist competition. In our view, only enterprises in which a previously established number of brigades follow this method should claim the championship. Assessing competition results, obviously, we should take into consideration as well the number of workers employed in the complex brigades (compared with the overall number of workers), and the percentage of the items they manufacture. The following quality indicators should be taken into consideration as well: output per worker in cost accounting brigades and by the enterprise as a whole; share of goods delivered without claims; utilization of machines and equipment; and reduction in production costs and material outlays.

"The struggle for effectiveness and quality," noted Comrade L. I. Brezhnev at the October 1976 CPSU Central Committee Plenum, "means that every party member and each party organization must comprehensively encourage and disseminate truly efficient and useful initiatives. They must firmly eliminate anything hindering creative thinking and innovation and our progress." In my view, these words are most directly applicable to the brigade contracting method. We believe that it could be applied on a broad scale in all industrial sectors, particularly at middle-sized enterprises engaged in individual, small-serial, or serial output.

The brigade contracting method in machine building is neither an accidental nor a temporary phenomenon. This form of labor organization represents the logical development and consolidation of cost accounting. It contributes to the growth of the initiative and activeness of the working people, makes possible the more energetic discovery of reserves, a more successful struggle for upgrading production effectiveness, and the successful implementation of the 10th Five-Year Plan.

DEMOCRACY OF THE GREAT OCTOBER REVOLUTION; SOME HISTORICAL FACTS AND THEIR FALSIFICATION

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 5, Mar 77 pp 50-62

[Article by K. Zarodov, doctor of historical sciences]

[Text] Discussions on the democratic nature of the first victorious socialist revolution are playing an ever-greater role in the current struggle of ideas, particularly in connection with the approaching 60th anniversary of the Great October Revolution. Why is it that precisely this aspect of our revolutionary history is attracting the attention? Because the successes of factual socialism, achieved under the conditions of true popular rule, the drastic aggravation of the crisis of the capitalist socio-economic system and political institutions, and the ubiquitous and unparalleled involvement of the popular masses in independent historical creativity make exceptionally topical the question of the place of democracy in the class struggle and in the general process of the universal transition from capitalism to socialism.

The CPSU Central Committee decree "On 60th Anniversary of the Great October Socialist Revolution" emphasizes that with the victory of the October Revolution the establishment of the rule of the working class "insured in fact the existence of freedom and democracy for the overwhelming toiling majority, impossible in any capitalist country."

The bourgeois ideologues are trying to dispute this truth and are continuing to create pseudoscientific concepts and formulas adapted to the present with a view to supporting their thesis of the incompatibility between socialist revolution and democracy. All sorts of fabrications are being promoted on the "nondemocratic nature" of the October Revolution, and on the fact that, allegedly, the path of social progress in the contemporary world is not the path laid by the October Revolution.

The topic of the democratic nature of the October Revolution is exceptionally vast. The present article shall consider only a few questions which, in our view, are the most essential and, furthermore, which play an important role in the contemporary ideological struggle.

I

One of these questions is the attitude of the socialist revolution toward bourgeois democracy.

Our ideological opponents are promoting the thesis that the October Revolution stopped the democratized development Russia initiated with the February coup d'etat.¹ According to this view the system offered by the provisional government was just about a model of democracy, whereas, it is alleged, the October Revolution was its negation.

It is true that in the bourgeois-democratic revolution the people gained the type of political freedoms previously unavailable in Russia. V. I. Lenin noted that in February 1917 "The revolution overthrew the autocracy and gave the Russian people unparalleled freedom of a type found in no other nation in the world" ("Poln. Sobr. Soch." [Complete Collected Works], volume 32, page 49). The most important feature of post-February democracy was the factual division of the power between the bourgeois provisional government and the soviets which already represented a form of real popular rule. Thanks to the soviets, for a few months the authoritarian and conservative tendencies of the government were substantially hindered and the unparalleled extent of freedom mentioned by Lenin was achieved.

At the same time, however, Lenin saw in the democracy gained in February "relative and incomplete freedom" ("Poln. Sobr. Soch.," volume 31, page 5). There were more than adequate grounds for such a characterization, for the democratic regime established by the bourgeois revolution was nevertheless a regime of bourgeois democracy precisely and this was always reflected on both the content and forms of its activities.

Let us begin with the fact that freedoms which were considered maximal in the country in terms of the standards of the times, left unsatisfied a number of most urgent democratic requirements of the people. Nothing was done to stop the war and make peace as demanded by the overwhelming majority of the public and, unquestionably, by the toiling masses. The agrarian problem was not resolved and the peasantry--the majority of the Russian population suppressed by need and totally dependent on the land owners--was in fact deprived of most basic democratic rights and its attempts somehow to change to situation were suppressed mercilessly. The government also hindered the implementation of the most urgent demands of the industrial proletariat such as the introduction of an eight-hour working day.² Finally, the right of the nations to self-determination was not recognized even on paper and any active manifestation of the national interests of the non-Russian population of the country was banned and punished. In this connection Lenin indicated the hypocritical nature of the policy of the provisional government which suppressed the national-liberation aspirations of the peoples in the name of "democracy" (see "Poln. Sobr. Soch.," volume 32, page 253).

Even bearing in mind purely political elements of democracy such as freedom of speech, press, assembly, street marches, and so on, in this respect as well the regime of the provisional government (in all four of its compositions) was quite different from its western promoted image. Huge actions opposing the democratic activities of the working people in April, multiple bands of peaceful demonstrations, persecution of bolsheviks, arrests of their leaders following the July events, and raids on bolshevik newspaper printing presses, uninterrupted throughout the entire period from February to October, are concepts which do not fit precisely the concept of "liberalism and democracy" which, according the falsifiers of 1917 history was unrestricted in the post-February period.

Indeed, whenever the systematic implementation of political freedoms conflicted with the interests of the ruling exploiting classes acute crises broke out in the development of the revolution. These were crises of the twin rule system, crises of the entire post-February democracy. The third of the series of such crises--the July crisis--ended with the total conversion of the Eser-menshevik majority in the soviets to the side of the provisional government and the establishment of the undivided bourgeois political rule in the country. This legitimately led to an alliance between the official regime and the counterrevolutionary forces, and the fact that the political and economic "Kornilov movement" turned into a factual and permanent menace threatening the democratic gains of the people.

All this enables us to understand the triple role of the October Revolution concerning democracy. First, the socialist revolution wrecked the plans of the provisional government aimed at the further elimination of political freedoms in the country. It crushed the bourgeois governmental machinery and prevented the establishment of a military dictatorship for which the reaction was openly appealed as early as October as was the case, for example, at the second congress of bourgeois "public leaders" in Moscow.

Second, the working class system, created with the October Revolution, immediately carried out those same democratic changes which the country failed to receive from the provisional government and from the bourgeois and conciliationist parties which alternated and supplemented each other within the provisional government. The Decree on Peace proclaimed by the Soviet state put a firm beginning to the practical implementation of the most important democratic requirement of the peoples not only of our but of all other countries who had been coerced by their governments to participate in the imperialist slaughter.

The medieval obstructions in the social political life of the country--landed estates, national oppression, church privileges, rightlessness of women, and lowered status of the working man--were swept off by the socialist revolution. All such long-ripe problems of democratic renovation of Russian society were resolved by the October Revolution, as Lenin wrote, "Along the way, in passing, as though a 'side product' of our main and principal proletarian-revolutionary and socialist work" ("Poln. Sobr. Soch.," volume 44, page 147).

Third, finally, the radical reorganization of socioeconomic relations initiated by the October Revolution laid, on the one hand, a material foundation for the implementation of the democratic rights of the toiling people proclaimed by the law and, on the other, prepared the grounds for the promulgation in social life of freedoms unparalleled under capitalism and, above all, the freedom from exploitation of man by man. Thus the October Revolution not only asserted democracy in social political life but, for the first time in the history of mankind, made its base--the realm of socioeconomic relations--democratic.

Therefore, whereas it is essentially true that with the victory of the socialist revolution democracy as maintained under the provisional government came to an end, this is not to say in the least that the October Revolution represented a "negation" of the February democratic gains. On the contrary, they were preserved, developed, and intensified by the Soviet system and, at the same time, given a new content previously unknown in history.

II

The question of the democracy of the socialist revolution is inseparably linked with that of the correlation between the independent revolutionary creativity of the masses and the organized activities of the political vanguard of the working class. Addressing themselves to the 1917 events in Russia, the bourgeois and reformist authors are trying to resolve this problem with the help of a simple formula according to which, allegedly, the February coup was the result of the spontaneous movement of the people, an unorganized mass action, whereas the October Revolution, it is alleged, was the work of no more than a small organized group of bolsheviks acting without popular mandate and without the support of the people's initiative. In other words, the first case is considered to be "spontaneous only," while the other is "organization only."³ Hence the conclusion that in October the democracy of the masses was suppressed by the "bolshevik organization."

Unquestionably, in the February bourgeois-democratic revolution the struggle of the popular masses, the working people, played a key role rather than the conspiracy of a handful of Duma leaders, generals, and allied diplomats, as the monarchists claimed. It is not correct, however, to say that there was no organized basis at all in this revolutionary upsurge. The claim constantly repeated in the works of bourgeois historians to the effect that the organizing role of the bolsheviks "did not appear in the least" in February is twice as untrue.⁴

What makes people calling themselves historians to cling to the fabrication of the "February spontaneous element without the participation of the bolsheviks" ignoring widely published irrefutable documentary proof? It is the fact that this creates the possibility to use, yet once again, the method of pitting the October against the February revolution within their system of arguments allegedly proving the "unpopular" origin of the Soviet system and the "undemocratic" nature of the October *cout d'etat*. According to the

reformists this concept offers additional proof of the "betrayal of Marxism by the bolsheviks," since, allegedly, in October 1917 they virtually replaced Marx's theory of socialism, as a natural product of the class struggle, with the doctrine of the "artificial and coercive and undemocratic" establishment of socialism in a society which opposed it.⁵

This is what our ideological opponents say. Yet, here is what says the true history of the October Revolution.

The eight months which separated the bourgeois-democratic revolution from the socialist one were noted by the steady growth of the organizational level of the toiling masses and the revolutionary forces of the people. This was a tremendous service performed by the Bolshevik Party which was able to secure the conscious and responsible involvement of the progressive workers, soldiers, and seamen, and the peasants and intellectuals in purposeful revolutionary work. It would be unnecessary to retell here the familiar picture of the organized, selfless, and disciplined activities of tens of thousands of members of the Leninist party and of entire party organizations in the preparations for and making of the socialist revolution. The unquestionable truth is that without the type of combat political organization, developed by Lenin and the Leninists in the course of decades, the victory of the working class would have been impossible and the country would not have been rescued from national catastrophe.

The pre-October period was a time of development of the revolutionary initiative of the popular masses unparalleled after February. In the autumn a powerful striking movement was launched by the proletariat which frequently developed into the establishment of a worker administration of enterprises and the factual transfer of local power to strikers' committees or soviets. In September-October the peasant movement and "agrarian disturbances" reached the scale and level of a real uprising of the toiling countryside. Army units frequently joined the rebellious peasants. At the same time at the front a wave of opposition to the continuation of the war among the soldiers rose. The soldiers wanted peace and engaged steadily in attempts to fraternize (from September to October the number of cases of fraternization quintupled). Essentially the army was no longer controlled by the military authorities and officers were rapidly losing their control over it.

The October armed uprising relied, consequently, on the support and the organized and spontaneous movements of the masses. Far from all participants in this movement deliberately followed the bolsheviks and even fewer were members of bolshevik organizations. As a whole, however, they provided the sociopolitical force for the revolution which, on the eve of the October Revolution, was already enjoying a predominant influence in the country and which gave the subsequent coup the nature of a popular revolutionary violence, i.e., the violence of the democratic majority over the exploiting, i.e., the anti-democratic minority.

Therefore, in both the February coup d'etat and the October uprising the initiative of the masses was combined with organized revolutionary work. The difference between February and October is precisely that at the time of the breakup of the socialist revolution the autonomous political and social activeness of the people was considerably higher; the level of organization of the working class and working people, headed by the Leninist party, had reached a higher level.

Acknowledging the importance of the organization factor, our ideological opponents are trying to present it not as the strong but as the weak side of the revolution. According to their logic, organization in a revolution is something which turns it into a "minority project," giving the revolution an "elitist" nature, and separating it from the "truly popular" initiative or, in a word, depriving it of all democracy. Such fabrications are refuted by the entire experience of the October Revolution. It was precisely that revolution that proved the need and legitimacy of the organic interaction between the two most important factors of revolutionary success: the party organization of the leading class, the proletariat, and the maximally released creative energy of the masses. In this combination of organization and discipline, on the one hand, and free popular initiative, on the other, the democratic nature of the October Revolution gained one of its most outstanding and essential manifestations: not only was a scope provided for the independent expression of the basic interests of the social majority but a means was secured for the practical implementation of such interests. Organization made possible to convert the democratic demands of the masses into their democratic gains.

III

Naturally, no democracy can exist outside of its specific forms of manifestation. The question of the role and place of elections in the preparations for and making of the socialist revolution is related to this fact.

Our critics have long used the thesis according to which, allegedly, the bolsheviks are guilty of ignoring the will of the people expressed through elections in the course of the preparations for the October Revolution and at the time of the uprising and the period of consolidation of the Soviet system. The bourgeois and reformist ideologues assume that this is the most sensitive and vulnerable spot which reveals the "original anti-democracy sin" inherent in the bolsheviks. However, let us look at historical facts.

The stormy history of 1917 is filled with numerous electoral campaigns, elections, meetings, and passing of resolutions. An exceptionally large number of elective social administration authorities were established on the crest of the revolutionary upsurge--central, local, trade union, shop--authorities either possessing a certain power or representing simply public and political forums expressing the feelings of the currents represented in them. In the post-February months elections and reelections were held

by the soviets of worker, soldier, and peasant deputies, for all-Russian soviet congresses, and for city and rayon dumas, as well as elections for zemstvo assemblies, i.e., for local self-administration authorities left over from tsarist times; elections were held for factory-plant and army committees.

The falsifiers of history are trying to create the impression as though, to begin with, the bolsheviks were irreconcilably opposed to such electoral activities by the masses and that, secondly, allegedly the overall results of such elections invariably went against the bolsheviks.

What was the factual situation?

Let us consider, above all, elections for local self-administration authorities which were reelected over a long period of time, from May to September. The first elections for the Petrograd Rayon dumas (27 May-5 June) gave the bolsheviks 19.4 percent of the votes. The bolsheviks garnered 11 percent of the votes at the elections for the Moscow City Duma, on 25 June.

The percentage of votes for the bolsheviks reached 33.5 percent in the elections for the Petrograd City Duma (two months after the rayon duma elections); the September electoral shift in Moscow was even more impressive: 51 percent of the voters voted for the bolshevik candidates.

Let us now consider the situation of elections for trade union and shop organizations. There were 73 bolshevik delegates (more than mensheviks and Esers together) at the Third All-Russian Trade Unions Conference (21-28 June). The bolsheviks had an absolute majority in the factory-plant committees, since their very appearance after February. In the September-October re-elections for army committees the bolsheviks collected such a large number of votes that they could confidently say that they were backed by 40 percent of the army's personnel. They enjoyed absolute majority at the Baltic Fleet, and the northern and western fronts.

Finally, we come to the soviets. The number of pro-bolshevik votes rose steadily in the elections for such main organs of popular representation born of the revolution: the bolshevik faction had 13 percent of the delegates to the First All-Russian Congress of Soviets (June 1917); they had 51 percent at the second (October), and 61 percent at the third (January 1918).

The objective and careful consideration of all these figures convincingly proves that the general trend in the population's electoral activities was for rather than against the bolsheviks. This became clearer as the class contradictions in the country became aggravated and the masses acquired greater political experience. These data clearly show also that it was precisely the working people who tended toward the bolsheviks and voted for them evermore confidently.

Therefore, the truth of history gives no grounds whatever to claim that the bolsheviks suffered constant electoral defeats or to claim that in the struggle for the revolutionary change of system the Leninist party ignored forms of popular political activity such as elections and votes. On the contrary, the Leninist party systematically worked to enable the working people to make the broadest possible use of electoral rights and to defend as adamantly as possible their interests through elective institutions and organizations. The bolsheviks themselves actively participated in electoral campaigns and dedicated a great deal of work within the electoral organs to which they ascribed great importance as a means for involving the masses in political life and as one of the important ways for the manifestation of the popular will and for promoting the progress of the revolution.

We should add to all this that at the time of the October uprising the left wing Easers joined the bolsheviks on the most essential political problems. Combining the votes cast for bolshevik and left wing Easer soviet deputies, the total would represent an impressive majority which was formed precisely in the elections and precisely as a result of the voting. In other words, that very electoral majority whose "absence" is stubbornly claimed by the "democratic critics" of the October Revolution, was on the side of the revolution.

Some bourgeois historians halfway acknowledge this fact, stating that even prior to the October uprising the bolsheviks had essentially assumed political power.⁶ This concession, however, is granted only with a view to launching into considerations according to which there was no need for an uprising and that it could have been avoided. In such a case, the question naturally arises of why was it that the provisional government which had not only suffered a political defeat but was encircled by the armed detachments of the revolution nevertheless refused to surrender the power?

The answer to this question, whose serious discussion is avoided by both bourgeois and reformist ideologues, is that, as the bolsheviks saw in October 1917, a victory at the elections and in political institutions cannot be in itself the final victory of the revolution if the overthrown system retains the means and forces to oppose it in a violent nonpolitical manner. The circumstances in Russia in the autumn of 1917 prove exceptionally convincingly that the class struggle, following its objective laws, develops into the forms which each of its participants chooses in accordance with his own interests and possibilities. The experience of the October Revolution and the establishment of the revolutionary system of the working class also proves that the democracy of political movements, actions, and institutions is determined not by their form or, in any case, far less by the form than by the real class content which they acquire under the specific conditions governing social life.

Thus, the constituent assembly--this vestige of bourgeois parliamentarianism in revolutionary Russia--had the appearance of a politically democratic institution. In fact, even without awaiting the outcome of the elections,

and unaware of the future breakdown of the seats in the constituent assembly, the counterrevolutionary forces launched energetic activities to convert it into a banner for the struggle against a Soviet system. The electoral commission, as V. Nabokov, its deputy chairman, recalls, assumed a position "based on the nonrecognition of the newly appeared 'Sovnarkom' authority" ("Arkhiv Russkoy Revolyutsii" [Archive of the Russian Revolution], volume I, Berlin, 1922, page 92). The "Committee for the Defense of the Constituent Assembly," set up by anti-Soviet forces, in cooperation with the Military Commission of the Eser Party Central Committee, undertook a detailed elaboration of plans for the physical elimination of the heads of the Soviet state. If we are to believe one of the active participants in this conspiracy, the Eser B. Sokolov, this sinister plan was close to being implemented ("Arkhiv Russkoy Revolyutsii," volume XIII, Berlin, 1924, page 46-47). The reaction was planning an armed uprising for the opening day of the constituent assembly, i.e., for 5 (18) January 1918. However, it was simply unable to rally the necessary forces. Such was the halo of "legality" and "democracy" surrounding the constituent assembly prior to its convention, not to mention what took place later, when the representatives of its right wing majority became the political inspirers of white terrorism.

Conversely, the October armed uprising, a violent act, was a manifestation of true democracy, for in this case a popular majority exerted violence over an exploiting minority which had most clearly shown both its inability and unwillingness to take into consideration the interests of the country and the people.⁷

IV

The profoundly democratic nature of the socialist revolution was manifested to its fullest extent in the complex set of measures taken by the party and the proletarian state system to consolidate the victory gained in October. Noteworthy in this connection is yet another of the theses formulated by the falsifiers of history in an effort to prove the "undemocratic" nature of the October Revolution. It is that the Soviet system was retained only through the "force of arms." Occasionally the supporters of this idea express a "sympathetic understanding" of the particular conditions in which the newly born Soviet state found itself and in which, it is claimed, it could act "only" through military force and coercion.

Without belittling in the least the historical role of weapons in protecting the system which the working class seized in October, we should most clearly emphasize that the main factor for the consolidation of the new system was its support by the popular majority.

Since the capitalist power was overthrown and, in general, during the initial periods of the revolution, the broad masses, the peasants above all, "loaned," as Lenin said, their support to the proletariat (see "Poln. Sobr. Soch.," volume 45, page 77). It was the policy of the Soviet system and

its constructive activities (and by far not exclusively the successes of the armed struggle against the domestic and foreign counterrevolution) that determined the proper use of this "loan" and the final establishment of the popular majority on the side of the victorious working class.

Two main directions could be singled out in the work done to this effect by the Bolshevik Party and the Soviet state. First, to undermine the economic power of the exploiters and break down the bourgeois socioeconomic system itself. This led to a weakening of the bourgeois pole which objectively attracted the owner existing within every petty bourgeois. As Lenin pointed out, "Through its struggle, through revolutionary struggle, the proletariat destroys capitalist ownership relations and, therefore, the capitalist determinants (and motivations) of the will and decisions of those who hesitate" ("Poln. Sobr. Soch.," volume 39, page 457).

Secondly, the practical decisions of the Soviet system soberly took into consideration the interests and requirements of all working people and of all population strata and groups distinct from the bourgeois and land owners' upper crust. This is most clearly confirmed by the very attentive attitude paid to the instructions, demands, and expectations of the peasantry. Just as indicative were the concern and respect for the members of the intelligentsia, even the officers and generals of the old army who honestly, even though not without hesitation, demanded that their efforts and talents be applied in the new society.

In practice the process of shaping a reliable support for the Soviet system was quite complex and has never been oversimplified by the Marxist-Leninist science of history. As Lenin wrote, "Reality shows that only in the course of a lengthy and fierce struggle the difficult experience of the oscillating petty bourgeoisie leads it, after comparing the dictatorship of the proletariat with that of the capitalists, to the conclusion that the former is better than the latter" ("Poln. Sobr. Soch.," volume 40, page 17). It is important, particularly taking into consideration the topic of the present article, to emphasize that the choice between the two class dictatorships made by the representatives of the petty bourgeois and intermediary population strata, initially developed in the people's minds not in the least as a choice in favor of socialism and against capitalism. To the overwhelming masses this was, above all, a choice precisely in favor of democracy and against rightlessness. This particularly applied to the peasantry which, within a short period of time and in many parts of the country, repeatedly changed its political sympathies but which, in the final account, firmly took the side of the Soviet system, convinced through its own experience that the Soviet system alone would factually acknowledge the vital interests of working farmers.

The fabrications of the bourgeois authors concerning our revolution abound in assertions to the effect that bolshevism "trampled the individual," "suppressed his freedom," and so on. However, the study of human documents--

the letters and diaries of that time--eloquently proves that it was precisely the respect shown by the Soviet system for the common man that was the main reason for which millions and millions of simple citizens of the country were drawn to it. The simple stories of common people, of working people who lived during the revolution and who, according to bourgeois historians, were the "indifferent" mass offer clear proof that, even though hesitating and doubting, they took the side of the Soviet system precisely because, unlike all systems they were familiar with--tsarist, provisional government, white guards, occupation, or bourgeois-nationalist--this system acknowledged and asserted their rights as people, their civil rights, and their human dignity.

Thus the October Revolution and the Soviet system embodied the hopes and aspirations of the popular "lower classes". In this sense Lenin and the bolsheviks never tired to emphasize the "plebian" nature of the proletarian, of the entire revolutionary movement in Russia, and of its gains.

The falsifiers of history are occasionally unable to agree among themselves: some claim that the socialist revolution was alien to the Russian national spirit and was "imported" into Russia; others claim that, conversely, this revolution stemmed not from "Marxism" but from "Russian rebellious traditions." The disparity between these views is lesser than the gap which separates them from historical reality. Naturally, Russia had not "imported" Marxism but, to use Lenin's words, had suffered it through. On the other hand, the October Revolution continued the cause of the popular liberation movements of the 17th to the 19th centuries and the cause of the two previous Russian revolutions in the 20th century, leading society to the implementation of the ideals which had been elaborated over a number of decades by the most progressive democratic Russian thought. The best representatives of the old intelligentsia came to the revolution and took the side of the Soviet system precisely because they considered themselves the spiritual heirs of Radishchev, the Decemberists, Hertsen, Chernyshevskiy, and the revolutionary Narodniks, and could not act otherwise. Consequently, historical reality is no grounds for the repeated statements made by bourgeois and reformist authors that the first victorious socialist revolution took place in a country unfamiliar with democratic traditions.

Systematically democratic in terms of its class nature and inseparable links with the people, the revolutionary system of the proletariat endured precisely because it enjoyed in the country not only the broadest social but, if one may say so, national-historical and intellectual foundations.

Hence unparalleled humanism was displayed by the Soviet system literally from the very first days of its existence. It is a historical fact that Lenin and the bolsheviks did everything possible to exclude or, at least, reduce to a minimum acts of violence, armed in particular, following the transition of state power to the working class. At the 4 (17) November Petrograd Soviet session Lenin stated that "The terror used by the French

revolutionaries who guillotined unarmed people is not used and, I hope, will not be used by us" ("Poln. Sobr. Soch.," volume 35, page 63). As early as 26 October (8 November) the Soviet government issued a decree abolishing the death penalty. The bolsheviks freed on their word of honor the most sworn among their enemies (ministers of the overthrown government, military academy cadets who had fired at the revolutionary workers during the uprising, General Krasnov, leader of the first armed action against the Soviet system, and others).

It was the armed operations of its enemies that forced the Soviet system to resort to weapons and military violence. The fact that the class and political struggle assumed its fierce forms in the first period following the October Revolution is explained, in the final account, by the factual absence of a solid social base not by the revolution but by the counterrevolution whose organizers and leaders, finding themselves in the minority, lost hope in the use of peaceful means of resistance and unleashed white terrorism.

The possibility and even inevitability of this "fit of despair" on the part of the overthrown exploiters had always been considered by the Leninist party and its greatest service to the revolution and the people was the organization of the timely and crushing resistance to the military pressure of the counterrevolutionaries. The victory won by the revolutionary armies in the civil war was not only a victory of the forces of the new social system over the armed supporters of a restoration of the bourgeois order. It was also the triumph of democracy over the blackest reaction.

V

"Despite the entire characteristics of the Russian conditions," emphasizes Comrade L. I. Brezhnev, "the October Revolution expressed the main, the basic trends of an entire historical epoch--the epoch of transition from capitalism to socialism--a transition prepared by the entire course of socioeconomic developments in the world." Unquestionably, the democratic nature of the October Revolution is one of these main trends. The October victory embodied an entirely definite law of the revolutionary transition from capitalism to socialism: the law according to which such a transition, representing an essential change of economic and social relations and, above all, the elimination of the exploitation of man by man, also changes the class nature of the social political system, i.e., destroys all its inherent privileges and advantages to the exploiting classes, establishing in their stead the factual rights and freedoms benefitting the working man.

In our time the strategy and tactics of the Marxist-Leninist parties of non-socialist countries inseparably link the possibilities for the reorganization of society on a socialist basis with the need for radical changes in the system of political administration, changes which would convert it from a weapon of bourgeois class rule into an effective instrument expressing

the popular will. The tremendous attention and interest which are invariably displayed in this connection by revolutionary and democratic circles in the experience of the October Revolution have nothing in common with the search for any kind of ready-made prescription or cliché fitting current political practices. On the contrary, this is a desire creatively to interpret the lessons of the revolutionary past, to accept them as living history providing a great deal of valuable and instructive facts but, naturally, not fitting any final or "forever mandatory" formula.

An entirely different approach to the assessment of the October Revolution and to the interpretation, in particular, of the question of the democratic nature of our revolution is characteristic of bourgeois and social-reformist ideologues and representatives of left wing-adventuristic currents. In fact, however different their writings on the October Revolution may be in terms of arguments or choice of materials, all of them rest on a common methodological denominator--making facts and judgments fit a predetermined concept.

The authors who clearly express in their works the class hatred of the bourgeoisie for the proletarian revolution depict the October Revolution as a violence over democracy. Liberal and reformist historians who deem it their duty to play at objectivism acknowledge that toward the autumn of 1917 sharp revolutionary changes had become an objective necessity in our country. In that sense they even "morally sanction" the conversion of the administration of the state to the working class and the toiling masses. Immediately after that, however, they hasten to provide stipulations and complaints to the effect that the revolution violated the "norms of democracy." Finally, left wing authors who usually enthusiastically praise the October uprising nevertheless caricature our revolution since, repeating the Trotskyite formulas, they depict it merely as a "courageous act" of the proletarian vanguard which, allegedly, pitted itself against the rest of society and which scorned the "nonproletarian" interests of its broad democratic masses.

In all such cases true history is replaced by clichés to whose benefit a careful selection is made of all facts related to revolutionary actions exceeding the framework of formal democratic procedures. Just as systematically anything which, in fact, served the democratic interests of the people and expressed them is changed, rejected, or ignored. This leads to the subsequent conclusion that the experience of the October Revolution acquires "ever-lesser" importance with the growth of the forces of democracy in the contemporary world.

The truth of history is far richer and more complex than any far fetched concept obeying the prejudiced search for theoretical or historical contradictions between the revolution and democracy. Whatever its path of development, the socialist revolution conflicts not with democracy in general but with a democracy of precisely limited bourgeois content. In Russia, in the fire of the struggle for a new social system a number of

forms and institutions of the former democracy, acquired in February, burned down. However, this was the result of a development of events specific to our country and our revolution. Our revolutionary proletariat struggled not against the forms of democracy but against the political system of bourgeois class domination, including its official-democratic cover.

Obviously, this aspect of the experience of the October Revolution has, under contemporary conditions, an even greater significance, rather than a "lesser and lesser one," for the working class and the other forces of social progress have grown and strengthened to such an extent that they are frequently able to use the existing forms of bourgeois democracy in their own interest and ascribe them the type of class content demanded by the struggle against monopoly power and the ruling capitalist group, for no gains of democratic rights and freedoms could eliminate the rule of financial capitalism, as Lenin emphasized, unless supported by changes affecting the very essence of socioeconomic relations in society" (see "Poln. Sobr. Soch.," volume 27, pages 253-254).

The October Revolution proved that attempts to give the forms of democracy a self-containing significance and place them above the ripe tasks of social progress convert, in fact, into the ideological and political weapons of those who oppose both social change and democracy itself. In Russia the counterrevolution--from Kornilov to the white guards--acted under the banner of saving democracy and did not conceal its intention of promoting the power of the bourgeoisie as a military dictatorship. Conversely, under circumstances marked by an extremely sharp class confrontation, only those who worked for the establishment of the revolutionary system of the proletariat and the working people, who supported and defended it with all possible means, proved to be the true democrats. This aspect of our revolutionary experience loses none of its significance, for today, more than ever before and, naturally, far more adamantly than in Russia in 1917, any party, even the most reactionary, tries to conduct its work under democratically-sounding slogans, defending obsolete procedures under the guise of "the interests of democracy."

The profoundly democratic nature of the October Revolution was a factor which exerted the strongest possible influence on the entire social and political history of the world and on its spiritual development. The revolutionary birth of a society ruled by the working man inspired the oppressed and exploited people in all corners of the earth and gave them the possibility to stand up straight and to believe in their forces. It had the strongest possible impact on the oppressors and exploiters, forcing them to become more flexible and more yielding to the demands of the people. It taught even the worst enemies of democracy to take into consideration, one way or another, the democratic aspirations of the masses. In this sense, more than any other event, the October Revolution democratized the social life of mankind in the 20th century.

FOOTNOTES

1. "The period of liberalism and democracy in Russian history lasted from February to October 1917," notes dryly yet significantly, for example, British bourgeois historian J. Dunn (J. Dunn, "Modern Revolutions. An Introduction to the Analysis of a Political Phenomenon," Cambridge, 1972, page 34).

The authors of the six-volume work "The Soviet System and Democratic Society. A Comparative Encyclopedia," bourgeois historians and sociologists from Western Europe and the United States, claim that the October Revolution represented a "destruction of revolutionary democracy" ("Sowjetsystem und demokratische Gesellschaft. Eine vergleichende Enzyklopadie," volume IV, Freiburg-Basel-Wien, 1971, page 924).

2. After awhile even Kerenskiy was forced to acknowledge that, "No headway was being made anywhere--in the army, on the agrarian problem, and on the problem of war and peace. One could say that the entire state was marking time, clinging to the Kadet stump" (A. Kerenskiy, "Izdaleka" [From Afar]. A collection of articles (1920-1921), Paris, 1922, page 235).
3. T. Hammond, professor at University of Virginia (United States) states with aplomb that "Anyone familiar with the facts knows that whereas the revolution of March 1917 was spontaneous the bolshevik revolution in November was not" ("The Anatomy of Communist Takeovers," edited by T. Hammond. Newhaven and London, 1975, page 2).
4. The bolsheviks, writes Dunn, in the already mentioned book, "judging by everything had done nothing at all to trigger the February revolution of 1917..." (J. Dunn, op. cit., page 39).

"...the February revolution," repeats after him British historian R. Theen, "was totally unexpected to the political parties in Russia, including the bolsheviks" (R. Theen, "Lenin. Genesis and Development of a Revolutionary," London, 1974, page 91).

5. One of the latest and quite typical laborings on this topic is found in the weekly published by the German Social Democratic Party (FRG). An article by H. Abosch claims that, according to Marx, the struggle for socialism "does not demand any cadre party at all to introduce it into the workers movement 'from the outside,' whereas the bolsheviks 'prefered a cadre party,' a 'conspiritorial organization,' an 'army,' with an authoritarian leadership and strict discipline." Allegedly, these ideas were "not borrowed from Marxism but from the traditions of Russian terrorism" (VORWARTS, 27 Januray 1977, page 29).

6. D. Geyer, Tübingen University professor (FRG) believes that "the secret of success was not the military means at the disposal of the military-revolutionary committee. The change of power in Petrograd was rather the result of the victory which the bolsheviks had already won in the area of politics..." (D. Geyer, "The Bolshevik Insurrection in Petrograd," "Revolutionary Russia. A Symposium," New York, 1969, page 207).
7. Let us point out, incidentally, that this violence was neither so cruel nor bloody as anticommunist propaganda is trying to present it. In the October coup d'etat six people died and about 50 were wounded (see "Istoriya KPSS" [History of the CPSU], volume III, book 1, Politizdat, Moscow, 1967, page 328). For the sake of comparison let us point out that during the "more democratic" February a total of 1,382 people were killed or wounded on the streets of Petrograd.

5003

CSO: 1802

THREE CENTURIES OF IMMORTALITY

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 5, Mar 77 pp 63-73

[Article by I. Vasil'yev and L. Naumenko]

[Text] One of the best sons of mankind ended his life on earth 300 years ago. He was a person whose memory today is revered even by the main opponents of his ideas, and even by the sworn enemies of the noble cause to which he dedicated his short bright life--theologians and idealists of all hues and shades. Centuries of vain efforts have convinced even them that it is impossible to cope with Spinoza through rebukes, slanders, or censorship. Today they are trying to defeat him using the weapon of "interpretation" most outrageously distorting the true meaning of the doctrine of this great humanist philosopher. Ridiculous though this might be, it is a fact. That same party of religious obscurantism which once published the text of the "great excommunication," banning forever the faithful not only "to read anything compiled or written" but even "come close to a distance of less than four feet from him" now, in the voice of Ben-Gurion, is begging from mankind the permission "to correct the injustice" and include the great heretic and God-fighter among its saints...

The acknowledged leader of modern positivism, Bertrand Russell, considered Spinoza one of the noblest and most attractive of the great philosophers even though he had previously stated that "the concept of the substance on which Spinoza based himself is a concept which neither our science nor philosophy could accept" (B. Russell, "Istoriya Zapadnoy Filosofii" [History of Western Philosophy], Moscow, 1959, pages 588,597).

Naturally, such interpretations could cast aspersions on Spinoza as little as the helpless old slander. The greater the distance separating us from the time of his life becomes, the more clearly we can see his true shape--the shape of one of the founders of modern science, of an essentially materialistic view of the external world and the inner world of man.

It would be no exaggeration to say that in Spinoza's doctrine mankind acquired, once and for all, a clear and unequivocal axiom of progressive-democratic culture--both intellectual and moral. Intellect and morality

made in his personality and his doctrine a truly wonderful alloy in which it is totally impossible to separate one from the other. This characteristic creates that which could be described only as profound humaneness and profoundly democratic thinking.

It would be difficult to fabricate something less fair than the legend of the "complexity," "incomprehensibility," or "inaccessibility" of the conclusions which constitute the essence of Spinoza's doctrine. In all decisive matters his conclusions are so simple and clear that they may rather appear as childishly naive views rather than the result of the intensive work of a mature and courageous mind, initiated in the clutches of cruel necessity, and in the clutches of the gravest contradictions of the epoch, contradictions of the development of bourgeois culture, which accompanied this development from beginning to its inevitable end--contradictions between science and religion, between word and action, between man and nature, between the individual and society, and so on.

By the strictly logical nature of its structure, his "Ethics" reminds us of the bright and erect Parthenon. It is a beautiful temple erected in honor of man and humanity, in honor of an entirely real and earthy man, who does not shy from anything that is human, including weaknesses, i.e., from the natural limitations of his nature...these same weaknesses and limitations which are "deified" by all religions, presented and accepted as unquestionable merits and as the "divine" advantages of human nature--as a result of which the true advantages of man begin to appear like sinful shortcomings. Spinoza does not try in the least to "deify" man. He merely tries to understand him as he is. This is the secret of Spinozicism.

The tremendous advantage of Spinoza's atheism compared with any other form of "Godlessness," which represented the power and wisdom of his strategy and tactic is related to that very feature of his personality and doctrine which we already described as profoundly democratic, and his sincere respect for the real and living--rather than invented--man of his time. Spinoza did not try in the least to amaze his contemporaries with his daring formula that "there is no God!," for he struggled not against words representing prejudices and superstitions, but against the superstitions and prejudices themselves, in their essence. He crushed prejudices and had a condescending attitude toward the terms expressing them. That is precisely why he turned to his contemporaries in the only language they understood: there is a God, but you, the people, imagine Him entirely differently from what He really is. You imagine Him as entirely similar to yourselves, ascribing to him your entire egotism, individuality, and national limitations, and all features of your own nature, including characteristics of the flesh, reaching thus the most obvious and ridiculous stupidities.

Thus Spinoza faces religious awareness with a very unpleasant alternative: either an anthropomorphic God, in which case He lacks all "divine" attributes, or else He possesses all these attributes but, in such a case, the concept of God should be purged from all traces of anthropomorphism and from even the slightest hint of His similarity with the thinking body of man.

This is a truly dialectical breakdown of the fundamental concept of theology and religion which totally destroys the cornerstone of religious-idealistic ethics and cosmology. One after another, all characteristics and attributes ascribed by religion are taken away from God and immediately returned to their true owner--man. As a result, God is deprived in general of anything definite and merges totally with the infinite totality of mutually exclusive definitions. In other words, nothing is left of "God" other than the name. He becomes unnecessary and, therefore, an unnecessary synonym of the word "nature," of which real man has always been, and remains, a small particle. The factual force and power of the word "God" over the people is nothing but the entirely real force of their ignorance of the real nature and order of things in the universe--the demoniacal force of ignorance, the force of the lack of real knowledge on the part of man about nature and himself.

Naturally, here we face atheism, so transparent and unequivocal, that it was immediately understood by everyone--not only by the educated theologians refined in detecting even the slightest hint of heresy, but any provincial priest as well. No atheist had ever drawn such a storm of indignation, hatred, and abuse on the part of the clerical forces. The forces of all religions, thus demonstrating total unanimity in understanding the fact that his doctrine represents the mortal condemnation not only of any specific religion or church but of a religious way of thinking in general, united in their hatred for Spinoza. Naturally, this degree of rage by the clergy revealed merely its total helplessness to refute Spinoza and pit against his doctrine anything other than abuse, curses, and threats. For entire centuries the word "Spinozist" was the synonym of "atheist." Centuries had to pass before the world's religions became wise to the fact that gross abuse of Spinoza was only emphasizing the tranquil power of his arguments, enhancing his prestige in the eyes of all thinking people.

Having dialectically broken down the religious-idealistic concept of "God" into its real components (a false concept of nature, on the one hand, and an equally false idea of the nature of man as a "particle" of that same nature, on the other), Spinoza thus formulated a positive alternative to the view his analysis had destroyed--the fearless and unstoppable sober-scientific study of the nature of man as a characteristic "modus" of nature in general, and the dialectical achievement of both in their unity and the unquestionable differences within that unity.

All in all, it is that same program which is still being followed in the entire development of world culture in its best and truly progressive trends and currents.

Spinoza himself perfectly realized that the specific implementation of his clearly formulated program for the intellectual and moral advancement of mankind was not a matter simple enough to be completed rapidly, for the exhaustive understanding of nature as a whole, which includes an understanding of the nature of man as a characteristic part of this infinite entity could be accomplished only through the joint efforts of all sciences dealing with nature and man and only as a target never to be reached. Therefore he did not entrust any specific science with the solution of this tremendous problem, whether mechanics, physiology, or philosophy, but relied only on their joint cooperative efforts aimed at achieving an adequate knowledge of infinite nature. For the same reason he never linked his views with the contemporary level of development of the natural sciences (as well as, in precisely the same manner, with the existing level of moral concepts of his contemporaries), perfectly understanding all their limitations, incompleteness and "imperfection." It was this characteristic of his views that was highly rated by F. Engels two centuries later: "We must acknowledge as the greatest merit of the philosophy of that time the fact that despite the limited nature of its contemporary natural sciences it did not abandon the right way and that, beginning with Spinoza and ending with the great French materialists, it made an adamant effort to explain the world on the basis of its own nature and leave the detailed justification of this to the natural sciences of the future" (K. Marx and F. Engels, "Soch." [Works], volume 20, page 350).

It is entirely obvious that it is impossible to understand or explain Spinoza's philosophy as the result of a simple "summation" of its contemporary natural scientific knowledge. It was based not on their existing level but on the historically progressive trends which could not be easily detected within the then-available knowledge. We must not forget that in his time the natural sciences were merely beginning to free themselves from the omnipotent power of theology and that the minds of the natural scientists--even of the greatest among them--were still excessively burdened by the prestige of Aristotelian theology with its idea of the "immanent" expediency of natural phenomena, i.e., of the existence of objectives within nature itself. Every step along the way the natural scientists turned to this concept for help. To a certain extent it rescued them whenever a purely mechanistic view of things, i.e., a one-sided mathematical viewpoint, or an abstract quantitative method for their description and interpretation revealed its obvious inadequacy. Teleology, i.e., a somewhat more refined form of that same anthropomorphism which dominated the realm of religious morality, appeared here to be a historically inevitable supplement to the grossly mechanistic outlook, as though the upside down mirror image of its imperfection. Such a "supplement" was fully inherent in all Cartesianism and, subsequently, in all followers of the great Newton.

It is easy to understand the type of philosophy that Spinoza would have left us had he simply (uncritically) summed up all successes in the natural sciences of his time, and even his real successes achieved through a systematic mechanistic way of thinking. The entire secret, however, was that in this case as well he displayed the amazing power to make a critical distinction in terms of such successes, for which reason his basically negative attitude toward teleology in general necessarily developed into a critical attitude toward mechanicism. This advantage of his thinking was manifested particularly sharply in his understanding of the nature of man and the solution of difficulties related to the Cartesian theory of the "body and soul," and the notorious "psychophysical problem."

The solution of this problem in Spinoza's concepts is striking to this day with its clear principle-mindedness and theoretical lack of compromise, and the amazing consistency which to this day--300 years later--is clearly missing in the thinking of some psychologists and physiologists who deal with the relationship between the mentality and the brain and the relationship between thinking and the physical condition of the human being, the human organism.

Spinoza's solution was simple as is anything that is brilliant.

He untangled the Gordian knot of the famous "psychophysical" problem made by Descartes with a single strike: there neither is nor could there be any "correlation" between the "soul" and the body of man (and even less so a causal, a cause and effect reason), for the simple reason that these are not two different "objects" which could develop a variety of reciprocal relations but one and the same "object" in two different projections resulting from its refraction through the dividing lens of our "mind."

For this reason the "psychophysical problem" in its Cartesian formulation is an imaginary problem existing only in the mind. It is eliminated from the agenda as a false formulation by an entirely different, real problem resolved through the critical study of the factual characteristics of the mind (specifically, the ability to imagine), which tends to see two different things where, in fact, there are only two different words describing the same factually indivisible "thing," in this case the thinking body.

The question arises, therefore, of how the human "soul" and "body" (physical conditions and "thinking") are "combined" so stupidly or how to "add" to the body its own extension. The very question contains the stupid assumption that a "body" is possible without an "extension," while an extension is possible without and outside a body...

The concept of a thinking body is precisely the real cornerstone of Spinoza's entire philosophy, the focal point of his opposition to Cartesian dualism, even though officially (as this philosophy is explained in his "Ethics") its cornerstone consists of axiomatically formulated definitions of "substance," "attribute," "freedom," "necessity," "final object," and "infinity."

This most important circumstance was frequently pointed out by K. Marx: "...thus, these are two entirely different things--that which Spinoza considered the cornerstone of his system and that which is the factual cornerstone" (K. Marx and F. Engels, "Soch.," volume 34, page 287).

It is easy to note that the "definitions" with which the "Ethics" begins in fact represent merely clear interpretations of familiar words and terms generally accepted at that time. The question of whether we could consider thought as the substance of the human soul (i.e., the real mind of the people) is an entirely different matter. Should it be considered only as an attribute, something conceived only by our mind as its substance, i.e., as the substance in its essential definition? It is easy to understand (which was immediately understood by his contemporaries) that the mind whose thinking represents the "substance" of the soul is Descartes' entirely real "mind," which, in this case, has surrendered all positions to the theologians. In this case Spinoza is entirely categorical, considering this concept as an illusion of our mind which he himself did not share in the least even though understanding its origins.

The real starting point and basic concept of Spinoza's system, on the basis of which he radically reinterpreted all the abstract-logical "concepts" of his epoch, is always a specific--a systematically materialistic--understanding of the nature of man, an understanding which has not been universally accepted to this day.

Man, and man alone, is the real object discussed here and on which Spinoza focuses his considerations, his theoretical studies, from beginning to end. Man alone is the "real subject" the abstract determinations of which are, in fact, all the characteristics which were initially postulated as unrelated to him--the characteristics of "substance," "attribute," "modus," and everything else.

Thinking is a property, an ability of matter or, as Spinoza says, an attribute of the substance. This view expresses the entire nature of the "intelligent" materialism of subsequent centuries, including our own--the entire powerful heuristic energy of materialism is contained in it as a tight spring, as a tight algebraic formula.

It was precisely by virtue of their precise definitions that Spinoza's formulas had a truly catastrophic consequence for the religious-idealistic world concept. They deprived the most skillful speculative structures of their foundations, their cornerstone they shared, with all gross and primitive superstitions. They still retain their entire crushing power in terms of such structures. Furthermore, they also exclude any possibility to interpret "thinking" not only as a particular immaterial principle which actively invades the "bodily substance" from some point on the outside in order to shape it according to its views, but also the logic of primitive and mechanistic materialism which tends to interpret "thinking"

as an unnecessary literary synonym (as an unnecessary term) of all the characteristic material processes which occur in the human brain, within the narrow space of the cranium. Such a purely physiological understanding of "thinking" is to Spinoza as unacceptable and stupid as the fantasy of the "immaterial soul."

Spinoza is perfectly aware that the "nature of thinking" cannot be understood merely by the consideration of events which take place within the single body and brain of the individual, for these events are merely a particular manifestation of something entirely different, i.e., the "power of external reasons," the universal necessity within which all bodies, including that of man, exist and act (move).

Therefore, the nature of "thinking" (as an ability distinguishing a "thinking body" from an unthinking body) is possible only if we consider the factual "body" within which thinking takes place by necessity rather than accident. Such a "body" turns out to be not the "pineal gland," not the brain, and not even the human body as a whole, but the entire infinite totality of "bodies" which includes the human body as one of its particles.

Considering thinking as an "attribute of the substance," Spinoza rises above all supporters of mechanistic materialism and outstrips his epoch by at least two centuries, essentially expressing the thesis subsequently formulated by Engels as follows: "The trouble, however, is that mechanism (as well as 18th century materialism) cannot be taken out from abstract necessity and, therefore, even from accident. In this case the fact that matter has developed the thinking human brain is pure accident, even though necessarily substantiated, step by step, wherever this occurs. In reality, matter leads to the development of thinking beings by virtue of its very nature, as a result of which this necessarily takes place in all cases whenever proper conditions are present (not necessarily the same always and everywhere)" (K. Marx and F. Engels, "Soch.," volume 20, pages 523-524).

Hence the inevitable conclusion that "in all its transformations matter always remains the same and that not one of its attributes could ever be lost. Therefore, with the same strict necessity with which at one point it destroys on earth its highest product--the thinking spirit--it would create it again somewhere else, in another place or another time" (Ibid, page 363).

Need we prove that this reproduces the very same position held by Spinoza? Engels himself unequivocally emphasized the total coincidence of his views with those of Spinoza on this point. It was no accident that Plekhanov reminded us of this in the context of his debate with the Machists: "'Thus, according to you,' I asked, 'old man Spinoza was right by saying that thinking and its extension are nothing but two attributes of one and the same substance?' 'Naturally,' Engels answered, 'old man Spinoza was entirely right'" (G. V. Plekhanov, "Soch.," volume XI, Moscow-Leningrad, 1928, page 26).

What is important here is not only the coincidence of positions but the fact that it was precisely here that Engels saw the line basically dividing "wise" materialism from mechanistic materialism unable to cope with the dialectics of the interrelationship between "thought" and matter, inevitably finding itself in the dead end of the famous "psycho-physical problem."

The concept of the "nature of thinking," or of thinking as such cannot be structured in the image of the "mind and will" of the individual, i.e., according to the logic of anthropomorphism, followed in their considerations on this topic by both theologians and Cartesians. Quite the contrary: the mind and the will of the individual should be understood as a specific and characteristic manifestation (not in the least mandatorily "adequate") of this universal and "infinite" ability necessarily inherent not in the individual body but in the infinite totality of such bodies related within a single entity, constituting, according to Spinoza, "as though a single body."

This universal ability belongs to the individual body only to the extent to which it can exist and act in accordance with the necessity which links it with all other bodies, rather than in accordance with the special nature, form, or position of particles of which it consists.

In other words, by its very nature thinking consists precisely of the ability to carry out factual bodily functions according to the logic of any other body rather than the logic of the characteristic structure of the body performing such actions. This is the entire essence of Spinozism, the entire essence of the radical turn made by Spinoza in the history of philosophy--a decisive turn toward materialism.

The body is a thinking body to the extent to which it can actively structure its own actions and carry them out according to systems coordinated with the systems (form and disposition) of the totality of bodies of the surrounding world, the systems of universal necessity.

The real and earthly man, naturally, is far removed from this. However, to the extent to which he thinks he acts precisely thus and not otherwise. It is to the extent to which he acts as a thinking body that the measure of his freedom rises. We could say that, from the very beginning, the question of freedom in Spinoza blends with the question of the ability of the "thinking body" ("thinking object") to exist and act in accordance with the necessary order of all objects in the world around him.

On this point as well Spinoza's doctrine is the radical antithesis of Cartesianism, representing specifically its materialistic antithesis. According to Descartes, everywhere "freedom" operates as the simple synonym of "free will," i.e., of the ability of the "soul" to act, totally independent of the sum total of material circumstances. Generally

speaking, this was the same understanding of the problem of "freedom" subsequently preached by Kant and Fichte and all their followers, including the existentialists of our time.

According to Spinoza, such an understanding of "freedom" is, once again, merely an illusion of our own (limited) mind, totally unrelated to reality and independent of it. This illusion arises quite simply: by virtue of the ignorance of the real reasons which motivated the "thinking body" to act thus and not otherwise.

Therefore, the fictitious "freedom of will" turns out to be merely a mask concealing total lack of freedom or a necessity manifested as an external coercion which becomes even more insurmountable because the "thinking body" not only does not see but is actively unwilling to see the external reasons whose slave it is.

According to Spinoza freedom consists of the ability of the thinking body to act while taking actively into consideration the sum total of "bodily" circumstances and conditions of such action rather than to obey blindly spontaneous immediate accidental circumstances. The "thinking body," which looks not only at the immediate external "reasons" directly influencing it, but the more remote ones as well, is capable of acting regardless of the pressure of accidental and brief situations but in accordance with the overall integral necessity of the external world--in accordance with "the mind."

It is easy to understand how much broader, deeper, and, above all, more realistic such a formulation of the problem of "freedom" becomes compared with the Cartesian definition. Categorically rejecting the interpretation of freedom as "freedom of will," Spinoza formulates his understanding of freedom as the factual ("bodily") action of man, actively (i.e., consciously) determining the objectives and means of its actions in accordance with the overall--total rather than immediate--objective link with objects.

This may be anything but "fatalism," a tendency for which Cartesian opponents have jointly blamed Spinoza and his doctrine, to this day interpreting the problem of "freedom" exclusively as the "freedom of will," i.e., as a phenomenon within the single "thinking body," and as the absolute "independence" of the mind of the individual from the external world.

It is interesting to note that today the bourgeois philosophers level the same charge of "fatalism," of denying the "freedom of the individual," not only by Spinoza but by Marxism, using absolutely the same arguments and theoretical substantiations. Thus, the following definition of "freedom" is found in the West German "Philosophical Dictionary" by Henrich Schmidt (abridged translation from the German, Izd. Inostr. Lit., Moscow, 1961):

"Freedom (Freiheit) is the possibility to act as one wishes. Freedom is freedom of the will. The will is, in its essence, always a free will... Marxism considers freedom a fiction; in reality, man thinks and acts according to motivations and environment (see "Situation"), in which economic relations and the class struggle play the main role in his environment," and so on, in that same spirit.

Naturally, a "freedom" such as the "freedom of the will," is equally rejected both by Spinoza and Marxism, replacing this imaginary freedom with true freedom achieved only through action coordinated with the general trends governing changes in universal-historical "situations," rather than immediate pressures, or empirical-existing situations influencing the "body" and the "mentality" of the individual...

It was precisely Spinoza who was the first to formulate a definition of freedom as action consistent with the universal necessity of the world, for only such action makes man the master rather than blind slave of "circumstances" and insures, in the final account, the successful surmounting of obstacles on the path to a sensibly formulated objective, whereas the Cartesian understanding of freedom as freedom of the will of the individual, as the possibility to do "what one wishes," merely leads to the fact that such a "free will" encounters the insurmountable opposition of the "power of external reasons" and, conflicting with them, finds itself absolutely helpless and not "free" at all.

On this point even Hegel bowed to the wisdom of Spinoza's solution, having tried to rescue the Cartesian understanding of freedom through the anti-materialistic interpretation of universal necessity as the necessity of the "absolute spirit," as a purely logical necessity. However, in terms of the overall solution of the problem he took Spinoza's side against Kant and Fichte.

Both the formulation and solution of the psychophysical problem by Spinoza far exceed the limits of its particular content. The greatness of Spinoza and his enduring significance to the history of philosophy, science, and culture lie in the fact that he formulated exceptionally sharply and uncompromisingly the conditions for the proper formulation and solution not only of this but of any other similar scientific problem. These conditions contain the principle of materialistic monism, whose conceptual and methodological significance may be reduced to the simple yet capacious formula: to explain the material world on its own basis, without any side addition, and without any destructive "shortenings;" not information ("reduction") of series of phenomena directly conflicting with this common phenomenon found within each one of them separately but, conversely, the extraction of different and conflicting phenomena from the basically common reason which is entirely physical, standing at the origins of both. This is the path of the division of the entity into its opposites, the path of "materialistic deduction."

Spinoza clearly realized that if empirically obvious opposites (body and soul, mind and will, intellect and affectivity, and so on, and so forth) would be considered from the beginning as something given, determining them from the beginning as mutually exclusive series of phenomena, the problem of discovering their unity and necessary interconnection would automatically become insoluble. Spinoza considered that the only alternative to this path leading to the dead end street of Cartesian dualism was precisely the adoption of the opposite method, based on a clear understanding of the initial unity, and then determining why and how such an initial unity would create two not only different but opposite forms of manifestation. Therefore, Spinoza adopts most consciously the dialectical principle of the "division of the unity" (V. I. Lenin) which alone leads to an understanding (knowledge) of the real connection among phenomena which seem to our mind mutually exclusive and, therefore, "impossible to combine"...

Most generally, this is the path followed by the author of "Das Kapital," which is a logical form of an essentially historical outlook aimed at clarifying the real origin of empirically obvious differences and opposites. This is the principle of extraction opposite to "reductionism" whose entire wisdom consists of unsuccessful attempts to reduce the factual variety of phenomena in nature and history to a dispondent monotony, to a formally dead "unity" of heterogenous facts, and to an artificial substitution of the factual comprehension of life and of the conflicting relations within an infinite natural entity.

That is precisely why the positivists to this day hate Spinoza and his principle of "substance" so much. Their "logic of science" cannot be combined with this principle, for it is based on the childish idea that any "unity" of theoretical knowledge is created only by the language and exists only in the language, the "language of science," outside of which there exists only an unrelated and purely subjective "variety" of sensory impressions and "emotions."

If one or another quality (such as, for example, value, a measure, a spatial form, information, organization, and so on) would be considered "by itself," as a particular "abstract object," while the physical objects possessing this quality would be merely its "carriers," and be considered only "by themselves," this quality would necessarily turn into a special "essence" and acquire mystical properties similar to those of the "soul," only embodied in material objects, but totally independent from such characteristics by virtue of their "nature" or simply becoming unrelated to them. Such are the "numbers and figures" of the Pythagoreans, the "entelechy" (or "vital force") of the vitalists, the "value" of vulgar economists, the "structure" and "system" of the structuralists, the equipment, technology, legal norms, and moral "values" of bourgeois sociologists, the "symbols" and "meanings" of the logical positivists, and so on, providing for each group of phenomena a special principle for their

interpretation. The positivistic "philosophy of science" converts such abstractions and artificial creations of the mind into its own "objects," as a result of which arises its insoluble problem of linking the "objects" of science with its "subjects," words and objects, "symbols" and "meanings," scientific concepts with practice, and practice with the "commonplace realities" of daily life, as the well-known positivist F. Frank has said.

To Spinoza the inner unity between the phenomena of nature and human life is the original fact, a fact no less real than the variety appearing within it. To the positivists both exist only within the human body; the variety lies in his sensory perceptions while unity is found only in speech, in language. It is easy to understand that these are mortally conflicting positions. Spinoza's position is that of wise materialism extending its principles to understanding human nature and life, including his cognitive work. The position of the neopositivists is a reduction which reduces everything to physiological and linguistic abstractions, a psychophysiological idealism which begins by pitting events which take place within the human body against his brain and the events occurring in the world around him.

It is easy to understand that Spinoza's principled-monistic view of the correlation between these two series of events has retained its invaluable and still not fully appreciated heuristic significance to the solution of delicate problems such as that of the relationship between psychology and the physiology of higher nervous activities, the question of the correlation between "symbol" and its "meaning," the question of relations between mental processes and "external" behavior, and so on, and so forth. The outstanding Soviet psychologist L. Vygotskiy has frequently and convincingly written on the topical nature of Spinoza's principles in this area.

Is it an accident that the great Einstein wanted precisely the old Spinoza as his philosophical umpire in his debate with Niels Bohr? Here the entire matter was based on one or another interpretation of the problem of the "observer" of physical phenomena. Does man observe events in the physical world as a full citizen and representative of this world, as its "particle" obeying all physical laws without exception, or else are such events observed by an immaterial mathematizing "intellect," which observes nature "from the outside" and has nothing in common with it?

A choice is possible between two things: either Spinoza's consistent materialistic monism, or the dualism, pluralism, or relativism which divides the living entity of nature and man and, therefore, inevitably leads not only to pitting the "logic of science" ("order of ideas") against the logic of things, but also the dismemberment of the very subject of knowledge--the human mind--into a number of poorly connected departments subordinated to different "logics" (such as, for example, the "logic of empirical knowledge," the "logic of science," the "logic of mathematics," and the "logic of inductive sciences," and so on). This is

understandable, for the "researcher" or "observer" who deals in inanimate abstractions himself represents nothing but an abstraction separated from the factual subject of knowledge, from real man who acts in a real world.

The pivotal idea of Spinozism is the conviction of the need for a single general scale to determine the nature of things and the mind as a whole, a general logic which determines, as Spinoza said, the "order and link of ideas" in accordance with the "order and link of objects." In the opposite case, following its own "specific" logic, the mind could create nothing other than disorder. Abstractions are not objects. They are not subjects of thought and knowledge but the means for the same, a type of "road markers" which help man to be guided in the complex labyrinth of nature. The task of the real mind is to place accurately these markers at crossroads and forks which he follows, thus converting into a broad highway not only "science by itself" but science in its indivisible unity with practice.

Dialectical materialism alone can play in our days the role of such a logic of development of science and culture. Naturally, Spinoza neither created nor could create in his century such a logic. However, the problem of the creation of precisely such a logic was formulated essentially by him and contemporary dialectical thinking is inconceivable without Spinoza's work.

Would nature recognize itself in man? Or else would it see in man some kind of immaterial "intellect," floating outside of space, mysteriously linked with the sinful flesh of the scientist?

Spinoza's answer is simple and topical to this day. Nature is unfamiliar with "mind," "spirit," or "intellect." It knows only the entirely real physical-spatial man possessing a mind, a spirit, and an intellect. In other words, nature itself in its infinity is found in man (i.e., it recognizes itself), and not at all in those particular conditions experienced by the sterile "subject" of idealism--the Cartesian "soul" or the "absolute spirit" of Schelling and Hegel, Schopenhauer's "will," or the "pure information" of the belated supporters of Aristotle, who still consider knowledge as "pure form" perception without matter. Spinoza abolished all these and similar concepts of man's cognitive attitude toward nature 300 years ago. That is why for the past 300 years he has remained one of the most powerful fighters in the war to death between materialism and idealism in all its great varieties, including those presented as "contemporary science" and using the "language of science."

In his time he used the language of theology in defending the interests of science, while theology uses the language of science to defend the interests of superstition. This is the main difference between them.

This should make clear that nothing could be more false and unfair than accusing Spinoza of obsolescence. The attitude toward Spinoza is an attitude toward his principle--the principle of a systemic, monistic, and militant materialism. The reason for which contemporary bourgeois society refuses to accept the essence of Spinoza's philosophy should be sought within itself, in its principles.

The "secret" of the attitude toward Spinoza displayed by contemporary bourgeois philosophy could be exposed by using Marx's words addressed to a different epoch yet retaining their validity to both Spinoza's epoch and the epoch of contemporary capitalism: "...thus, after the setting of the sun for all the noctuid moth seeks the light of the lamp which the people light everyone for himself" (K. Marx and F. Engels, "Iz Rannikh Proizvedeniy" [From Early Works], Moscow, 1956, page 197).

Spinoza was a child of his time but not its supporter. He was the ideolog of the rising bourgeoisie but was never the executor of the will of petty merchants or big bosses. He was the conscience of his epoch, for which reason he expressed not only its contradictions, conflicts, obvious errors, and "conscientious" illusions, but its disappointments in itself and in its hope, the hope that it was possible to structure life in such a way in which the light of the "lamps" would fade when faced with the light of the "common sun," and that man would be worthy of the name "homo sapiens," appearing in front of integral nature with the total integrity of his being.

Last February marked the 300th anniversary of Spinoza's death; the 300th anniversary of the posthumous publication of his works--"Opera Posthuma"--will be celebrated in December. This is symbolic: the year of Spinoza's death became the year of his birth as a philosopher for mankind and for immortality.

5003

CSO: 1802

WINGS OF CREATIVITY

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 5, Mar 77 pp 74-84

[Article by V. Litvinov]

[Text] The long-range program elaborated at the 25th CPSU Congress profoundly substantiates the principles and conditions insuring the effectiveness of the party's policy, distinguished by true scientific character, objectivism, and a principled class understanding of the characteristics of our tempestuously developing epoch.

The party's policy is the policy of the people. That is why it enjoys the highest possible prestige in the country. The working people consider it their personal matter. Its implementation is binding more strongly the indestructible unity between party and people.

Elaborating the basic concepts of the party's guidance of state and public organizations, the education of the people, and organizational work among the masses, the congress paid particular attention to the style of management activities, a style which opposes in a Leninist creative and realistic way all formalism and subjectivism. "The leading and mobilizing role of the party," said Comrade L. I. Brezhnev in the CPSU Central Committee Accountability Report to the 25th party congress, "is no abstract concept. It represents life itself, our entire daily practice."

Our creative intelligentsia as well fully experiences the beneficial impact of the party's guidance. The Soviet literary workers owe it many of their ideological and artistic accomplishments. The party invariably trusts the creators of spiritual values. This is the basis for the harmonious relations which have long been established between it and the creative intelligentsia.

As we know, the talent of the artist can develop only if it is guided by a big idea valid throughout his life. The strength and luck of Soviet literature is that it is eliminated by the noble communist idea and that the party's historical objectives have penetrated the awareness and

creativity of the writers. The party gave them a great faith in man and supported their life-asserting pathos. The party's aspiration became the real wings of our art.

Soviet literature owes the Communist Party the current atmosphere in which it is easy to breathe and to work with inspiration. Such an atmosphere of sympathy and attentive attitude toward man, and of efficiency and confidence cannot fail to influence directly the quality of works of art. A truly creative atmosphere cannot be different!

As we recall, this was discussed at the Sixth USSR Writers Congress. The congress itself was a particularly expressive example of the way the historical party decisions inspire all artistic practice, and the way they are clearly reflected in anything that is interesting and significant in our present creative life.

It was impossible not to feel at this big forum the way the ideas of the 25th CPSU Congress are becoming the reality of the writers' affairs, enabling them to determine the fairway of artistic progress and imagine in its entirety everything created in recent years by the nearly 8,000-strong army of members of the writers' union. Above all, this enabled us to understand the tremendous possibilities we have today, the scale on which we must formulate our plans, and the base for our profound creative intentions.

In his Central Committee Accountability Report to the 25th congress Comrade L. I. Brezhnev pointed out the great attention which was paid at the previous party congress to problems of literature and the arts.

Let us recall that it was precisely at the 24th party congress that the basic thought was emphasized of the exceptionally increased significance of literature and art in molding the outlook and moral convictions and spiritual culture of the Soviet person. At the same time, the idea was expressed of the high duty of the artist: life demands full responsibility and higher ideological and creative exactingness in artistic circles. Works on our time need not only a topical subject, but the force of a real talent.

The idea of responsibility to the time applied particularly sharply to literary-artistic criticism of which the party demanded greater activeness in the implementation of the ideological line, strict principle-mindedness in the evaluation of books, and exactingness combined with tactfulness and with an extremely attentive attitude toward the creators of cultural values.

That is how problems of literature and art were formulated at the 24th party congress. The period between the two congresses was a truly fruitful one for the Soviet writers. It was a period of intensive work and major creative accomplishments.

"We can say today," noted Comrade L. I. Brezhnev, "that the approach of the 24th congress to problems of literature and art was entirely justified. The further energizing of the activities of the creative intelligentsia which is making an evermore substantial contribution to the party and national cause of building a communist society has been characteristic of the past years."

These words reveal a broad panoramic view of literary and artistic life. The literary chronicle of the previous years has recorded events and facts related to the broadening of international contacts among writers, the appearance of new journals and publications, and extensive creative discussions and debates. This included a regular all-union conference of young literary workers, the warm response with which the familiar party documents on motion pictures and literary-artistic criticism were welcomed by the artistic intelligentsia; Soviet literature days which have become widely popular of late; and national 10-day celebrations of the arts in which the writers report to thousands and thousands of their readers.

However, there exist among all these facts and events something truly decisive to all literary life: the books themselves, those big literary works which have justifiably become part of the spiritual treasury of the people, becoming a living part of the people. These are works which could teach us, support us, prompt us and give us aesthetic pleasure. Many of the currently popular books are worthy of this description. Let me name as an example "Sibir'" [Siberia] by G. Markov, "Zhivyye i Mertvyie" [The Living and the Dead] by K. Simonov, "Poteryannyi Krov" [Abandoned Roof] by Y. Avizhyus, "Goryachiy Sneg" [Burning Snow] and "Bereg" [The Shore] by Yu. Bondarev, the short novels by V. Bykov, R. Gamzatov's poetry, V. Shukshin's short stories, and others.

Inherent in the most significant works of our time is the ability to express both new developments in life as well as the characteristic features which appear within art itself and which determine its progress.

Some of these processes were quite clearly depicted in the reports and speeches delivered at the writers' forum: the success of the epic novel--the broad, philosophically thoughtful work (such as "Blokada" [Blockade] by A. Chakovskiy, or "Polesskaya Khronika" [Poless'ye Chronicle] by I. Melezh); the fact that the artistic-journalistic genre had intensified its analytical attention to daily facts of reality and, at the same time, was becoming evermore consistent with the "science of man" in literature; it was pointed out that in poetry (in particular in the poems of Yu. Martsinkavichyus, A. Kuleshov, M. Karim, and S. Narovchatov) the moral-dramatic element had strengthened. Characteristic in this respect is the success of plays on the working class. In recent years our literary artistic criticism has experienced fresh currents.

These processes are noteworthy in their own way: each carries within itself something new and contemporary. Each of them proves, one way or another, the general laws of literary development.

Let us particularly emphasize two such laws. First, it is the aspiration of contemporary literature to encompass reality evermore fully, in all its possible manifestations, on the basis of true historicism, demanding of the artist to see not only the present but the past and future of any phenomenon, clearly aware of its place and significance in the stream of historical events, an aspiration toward full life, unembellished truth about people and the times. The second is the evermore organic combination of the writer's ideal with the education of the communist personality--the high objective of the Leninist party.

These laws have been inherent in socialist art from the beginning, constituting its essence. The literary events of recent years confirm their unquestionable intensification and development and the new qualities of the culture of mature socialism which were given a comprehensive philosophical interpretation at the 25th CPSU Congress.

It was a question of a culture which represents the living embodiment of the Leninist theory of the cultural revolution, and the result of the dialectical development of everything that is best in the national-democratic traditions of the peoples of our country.

Justifiably the CPSU Central Committee Accountability Report to the 25th congress is described as the manifesto of developed socialism, and as an outstanding contribution to creative Marxism-Leninism. It focused within itself the most important communist views on our time, whether problems of world development and the revolutionary process, the principle of our party's economic and social policy and its ideological and educational work, or else views on the culture of a new type and on the place and role of the artistic intelligentsia in the building of communism.

One could imagine the importance of such a comprehensive elaboration of the decisive aspects of Marxist theory to every Soviet artist in order to strengthen his outlook, direct his creative search, and guide his practical daily work. Imbued with the life-bringing spirit of Marxism-Leninism, this report gives literature a great optimistic charge. It teaches us to approach contemporary events on a historical basis, and to energize its social pathos. "The concept of the growing role of literature and art in the spiritual life of the developed socialist society, expressed by Comrade Leonid Il'ich Brezhnev, CPSU Central Committee general secretary, the thought of the talent as national property, and the high assessment of the contribution made by literary workers to the national cause of building communism are to us, Soviet writers, an inspiring fact of tremendous force," states the writers' congress resolution.

Such is the view to the basic principles offered in the Accountability Report in terms of current theory and practice and, therefore, of the activities of every Soviet artist. At the same time, the report has a section dealing with writing, directly considering the most important trends of today's artistic search: the topic of the working class, the educational impact of art, and its moral criteria...Each such topic has its own books and extensive theoretical works, its problems and urgent tasks, and the complex creative reality which the writers' forum had to realize in its entire scale. The literary workers found in the CPSU Central Committee Accountability Report invaluable help. It was natural to consider it as containing reliable coordinates determining the dynamics and development of the collective writers' thinking, as topics which had drawn the attention of the Central Committee general secretary and had been intensified and brought to light in new aspects, in their ideological-artistic specifics and interconnections.

The idea of the many-sided comprehensive approach to the complex phenomena of reality and to social tasks was frequently repeated at the 25th CPSU Congress in the course of discussions on the unity among political, economic, and spiritual processes as a noteworthy characteristic of the developed socialist society; in the course of discussing the problem of combining the achievements of the scientific and technical revolution with the advantages of socialism; and in discussions on the principles of broad comprehensiveness in the creation of the material and technical foundations for communism, and the all-round development of the individual which requires the close unity among ideological-political, labor, and moral education.

All this is sensitively captured by our literature, particularly in works dealing with industrial topics.

Realizing that the life of the contemporary working class cannot be depicted from "purely production" positions, and abandoning the conventional literary systems they had become accustomed to, the writers began to turn evermore frequently to the main aspect which is the essence of our reality, and which profoundly excites each one of us separately and society as a whole. Priority was given to the working person who is being depicted evermore completely as a socially active individual, profound, and ready to defend his ideals to the end. One cannot fail to feel in this approach the live reaction of the writers to some of the acute needs of society, and to the sincere interest of the readers in contemporary industrial topics so characteristic of today. Intensely looking at such phenomena and facts, the authors of books on industrial topics came closer to the requests of their readers. They became socially more perspicacious and morally more responsive. The good results of this creative orientation were not late in coming, above all in new books, plays, and motion pictures.

Until recently the words "industrial topic" had a dry meaning. "Today this topic," Comrade L. I. Brezhnev pointed out, "has assumed a truly artistic shape."

Such a recognition of achievements in the creative field, which has always been the great concern of the public, gives us a great deal of obligations. Things are progressing. Now we must give a proper motion to this topic. We must develop and intensify its characteristics. We are still awaiting the classical work on the contemporary working man worthy of its high subject and hero. The reader is expecting it and is hoping to obtain it in the immediate future.

What is most important here? The most important is to describe the working class through the language of art as the leading revolutionary and constructive force of our epoch. It must be depicted on a broad and bold scale, in the flesh and blood of the working man, depicting him as representing the interests of all working people and all strata in our society.

A great deal was said at the writers' congress and the plenums of the board of the USSR Writers Union, to the effect that the artistic concept of our reality demands of the author a particularly profound philosophical insight and broad social thinking. Thus, the worker topic cannot be resolved without the proper penetration into the philosophy of modern labor and within its ideological, moral, and creative nature. In such a case the artistic study cannot fail to be comprehensive even if only because today labor has become the most accurate reflection of all ties between the individual and society and the historical process. Even if the author has set himself a seemingly very local task such as, for example, the depiction of the moral aspect of a given labor situation, and to depict the occasionally incredible tasks which may face a person and the high physical and moral qualities and exploits in self-advancement which the production process demands of him, in that case as well, as in similar ones, he must learn about other aspects of the labor process--political, moral, ethical...

In our country labor is the yardstick of human dignity, spiritual beauty, and strength of mind and spirit. It is labor as the expression of the true freedom of the individual, and as the decisive factor in shaping the individual. It has determined the nature of relations in the working class--its collectivism and mutual aid, organization and feeling of responsibility, fresh perceptions of life, and responsiveness to anything new.

Speaking of what precisely has contributed to the energizing of the industrial topic we could mention the permanent all-union competition for the best work of fiction on the contemporary Soviet working class, and on drawing the attention of our journals, publishing houses, and literary-artistic criticism to this topic; friendly contacts between literary and art workers, on the one hand, and worker collectives in enterprises, kolkhozes,

new construction projects, and builders of gigantic projects such as the Kama Automotive Vehicles Plant and the Baykal-Amur main line, have become a living mark of the times.

The elaboration of the production topic was also greatly helped by the joint support provided by other, neighboring, creative "fronts:" occasionally the working people are the heroes not only of books on the contemporary production process but on the war (such as "V Polden' na Solnechnoy Storone" [At Noon on the Sunny Side] by Vadim Kozhevnikov), on historical-revolutionary topics (the cycle of Leninist short novels by Mariya Prilezhayeva, and "A Ty Gori, Zvezda" [Shine, Star] by Sergey Sartakov), or broad historical-epic descriptions. Such works confirm, in their own way, the inspiring force which the character of the working person could become in terms of the poetry of a work, and the way the class views of the character influence the entire ideological and artistic structure of a book.

Books about the past--the distant or immediate one, about the war or the revolution, or on the birth of the working class or the unforgettable first five-year plans could become extremely consistent with our active present. The spirit of contemporaneity gives books about the past a particular educational impact, multiplying their ideological and emotional influence on the present generations.

It was precisely the educational aspect of works on the Great Patriotic War that Comrade L. I. Brezhnev noted at the 25th party congress: "Along with the characters of novels, stories, motion pictures, and plays, it is as though those who participated in the war are again marching on the burning snow of the front line roads, again and again bowing to the power of the spirit of their living and dead fellow workers. Meanwhile, the young generation of artists is becoming involved with the exploits of their fathers or of those very young girls to whom the quiet dawns became the time of their immortality for the sake of the freedom of the homeland. This is real art. Re-creating the past it raises the Soviet patriot, the internationalist."

The educational role of books dealing with the past has been repeatedly emphasized at the writers' forum as well, in the course of the discussion of books by V. Katayev, A. Nurpeisov, M. Shaginyan, P. Kuusberg, V. Bogomolov, and B. Vasil'yev.

The past reveals to us new historical heights. The energetic efforts of the social sciences, and the Marxist-Leninist analysis of one or another historical period, found of late in a number of familiar party documents and CPSU Central Committee decrees, have all had a beneficial influence on writing. Today the historical genre in our literature, if we discuss it as a whole, rather than discussing its best accomplishments, meets the type of criteria of conscious historicism which it could not even formulate in the past.

The best works written in recent years offer a convincing example of how to "read history" for the sake of the big and only truth, and how to make proper use of the unique tool of the writer's thought and interpretation. These best works also confirm the way the Marxist outlook is becoming ever-stronger in creative circles, and the way the principles of party-mindedness and historicism are being refracted evermore profoundly in artistic narration.

They confirm our class approach to history and the wise Marxist truth of the leading significance of the people in historical processes. They teach us to see how the friendship among the peoples of our country was born and strengthened, acquiring ever-better forms, and the way it withstood the severe trials of the war and brought about the creation of a new historical community--the Soviet people.

The main reader to whom the new books on historical topics are addressed is the youth who was born and grew up in days of peace, without experiencing either the wars or difficulties of past years. The youth will judge about what its elders knew by personal experience above all through books, through the destinies and characters of the heroes. That is why anyone writing about the past must feel a tremendous responsibility toward historical truth and the new generations, and for the historical book to develop in them an understanding of the acutely topical nature of history, giving them visual lessons in internationalism, and helping them somehow personally to experience the reality of the struggle waged by the party and the people for our ideals.

The finding of correct literary ways and the development of the historical-revolutionary genre are invariably helped by Marxist-Leninist theory; also reliable aid is given by the facts of reality itself, for today the artist concretely presents a great deal of that which was so passionately sought and for which the best minds of mankind struggled. Lenin's prediction--a developed socialist society--has been achieved. Its new and outstanding features were convincingly described at the 25th party congress, in the Central Committee Accountability Report and the numerous addresses by delegates who had come from all parts of our huge country and from all the sectors of the building of communism. In their speeches the mature socialist society proclaimed its existence through reliable figures and irrefutable facts. It is on the basis of such vital realities that today we could confidently determine what is a national state, what are the specifics of the development of the political system and social structure and the political forces and social relations, what are socialist democracy and national culture in a society unparalleled in history. This is a society humanistic in its very nature. It has elaborated its own essentially new laws of social progress.

The significance to art of such clarity could be hardly overestimated. Marxism has always taught us that the example of life itself is the best example. "Socialism," the Central Committee Accountability Report to the 25th congress states, "is already now having a tremendous impact on the thoughts and feelings of hundreds of millions of people on earth."

One of the big problems exciting the writers is that of the moral search in contemporary Soviet literature. This search imbues a number of topics dealing with the working class of town and country, the war, or the revolutionary past. It would be impossible to imagine a true work of art not addressed to the soul, the conscience, and the humane feelings of our contemporary. At a time when the moral factor and the aspects of social psychology are subjects of such lively interest the moral topic assumes for the artist the meaning of a kind of creative "supertask." It is precisely in it that the general problem of art--typical characters in typical circumstances--is expressed most clearly.

We know what thoughtful and comprehensive study was made of the topic of morality at the 25th CPSU Congress. It was considered in a special section on moral education tasks. Comrade L. I. Brezhnev turned to it again and again in his discussion on literature and art and in the final part of his report.

The moral ideal of the contemporary Soviet person is incompatible with a conciliatory attitude toward any violations of the laws governing the socialist society, parasitism, private ownership tendencies, hooliganism, bureaucracy, and indifference, which contradict the very nature of our system. Our system and our society are fighting such deviations using the ways and means available to the socialist arsenal: the opinion of the labor collective, press criticism, the emotionally effective words of our art, methods of persuasion, and the power of the law. The law of life is such that the more successful our accomplishments become the more intolerant we become toward the individual violators of social moral norms.

With all this, the main task of moral education is positive. It is important to help the person to elaborate an active position in life and a conscientious attitude toward his social duty; he must develop as an individual with an inner integrity whose word is strictly combined with his actions and own moral precepts.

That is how moral education was discussed at the party congress. This is one of the necessary aspects of this greatest of topics which, one could say, inspired its entire work and all speeches. It was the topic of the member of the new society.

Turning directly to the moral searches of literature and art in recent years, Comrade L. I. Brezhnev said: "A certain price was paid here but, nevertheless, there were great achievements. The merit of our writers and

artists is that they are trying to support the best qualities of man--his principle-mindedness, honesty, and depth of feelings, proceeding from the inviolable principles governing our communist morality."

Soviet literature is becoming a real university for the morality of the mass reader. It carries the ideas of humanism and social justice. It teaches good and endurance. It contributes to the beauty of the soul and the fullness of the individual. It is properly finding the guidelines of life by asserting the communist ideals in the human mind and feelings.

The Central Committee Accountability Report to the 25th party congress particularly emphasizes the idea of the profound and dialectical link between the establishment of socialist morality and the development of society and the upgrading of the people's prosperity. Each in its own way and with its specific style, recent books by F. Abramov, O. Kuvayev, M. Alekseyev, N. Dumbadze, V. Tendryakov, Ch. Aytmatov, A. Anan'yev, O. Gonchar, and I. Shamyakin describe the way our society is harmoniously combining the material with the moral and is strengthening ties between them. The age-old moral postulates themselves are being transformed and are gaining a rich content as the tasks of communist education are consolidated. "Let us recall Lenin's words that everything which serves the interests of the building of communism is moral in our society," Comrade L. I. Brezhnev pointed out.

That is precisely why today the moral theme in art requires major social substantiations. It is easy to note how some works, deprived of a philosophical-ethic foundation, and of an understanding of the complexity of the inner world of our contemporary, hopelessly lose aesthetic clarity and emotional impact on the reader. Nothing could be more harmful to this topic than cold moralizing, and a narrow interpretation of a moral problem outside the context of its social function.

The character of the communist, the leading fighter for the people's cause, becomes the embodiment of socialist morality in current books. His party principle-mindedness in public and private life is a characteristic criterion of the approach to complex moral conflicts. The bigger the character of the hero is, the richer his feelings and the fuller his spiritual world become. Our literary critics are as yet to consider comprehensively the noble role which communist characters have played in literature and historical reality and the great deal they have contributed to the education of the new man, the defense of the fatherland, and the assertion of the ideas of Leninism.

One of the characteristics of the contemporary approach to the topic of morality is the testing of the character in action, in working for the good of society, and in testing the moral principles and foundations of human nature in the crucible of complex social circumstances. "Nothing enhances the individual more than an active position in life...", was a statement made at the 25th party congress.

The struggle against the specific manifestations of a philistine and petty bourgeois mentality, and against that which contradicts the very nature of our system is a structural part of the concept of the character's social activeness (as well as of the concept of the social activeness of the artist himself). It has been frequently noted that any departure from the norms of socialist morality becomes, as a rule, mixed up with the sticky philosophy of philistinism, consumerism, and lack of spirituality. Their exposure is the factual assertion of the heroic principles governing our life. Unquestionably, the artist must approach the characters of false, and immoral people, the opposites of our way of life, with the same responsibility with which he depicts his favorite characters, the bearers of the moral ideals. We must write on complex and occasionally touchy moral topics with the same strict exactingness and honesty as found in the approach to such matters taken at the congress of our Leninist party! We have sufficient strength not only for the bold formulation of such problems but, above all, for their successful solution.

When the moral topic raises to such a scale it becomes a terrible weapon in the struggle against slack bourgeois morality, lifeless abstract "humanism," or leftist attempts to eliminate from art the moral ideal and delete from human life concepts such as conscience, goodness, honesty, or spiritual culture...

The morality topic particularly requires a philosophical and aesthetic interpretation in the light of the major and complex problems related to the scientific and technical revolution. The human factor is playing an ever-greater role in plans for material output, discoveries, and scientific and technical conclusions. No economic policy is possible without a preliminary study of the outlook, feelings, and reasons for human activities. Their conscientiousness, creative abilities, and social activeness are organic parts of the concept of technical progress. Professional skill is inseparable from inner culture and ideological belief. Contemporary production successes inspire the individual to develop his entire potential.

However, the dramatic aspects of the scientific and technical revolution are being reflected evermore clearly precisely in the moral world of the individual: the unparalleled complication of processes, the constant reorganization of the production process, the breakdown of customary systems, and the accelerated dynamics of progress. Only the understanding of the factual manifestation of the principle of harmonious combination of material with spiritual human needs at the present time could give the artist the courage to plunge into rather difficult problems related to the increased complexity of the inner development of man and the inordinate spread of relations between his work and private life and between his social efforts and world of intimate feelings.

Re-creating the picture of the moral life of our contemporary under the conditions of scientific and technical progress, it is important to make this picture reliable, extremely accurate, depicting the achievements of science and technology and fully disclosing the understanding of governmental interests and the interests of the future by our literary workers. Yet, we really wish that some books on our time, published recently and which are, unquestionably, talented should display this true scope and truly philosophical (and, therefore, statesmanlike) interpretation of the most complex laws which govern the development of society. Here our writers have not reached by far all landmarks. It is precisely in this direction that we face particularly responsible tasks.

The most important thing in this case is to understand that scientific and technical progress is not something superficial brought into the moral life of the working people of town and country. It was created by them and is developing and advancing by their will. To them the scientific and technical revolution also means a struggle against all kinds of egotism, callousness, and parasitical mentality; it is also a struggle for the harmonious development of the individual in the course of which the growth of material possibilities is also an ideological-moral, cultural, and spiritual growth. In their view technical progress is not only not asserted at the expense of human spirituality and fullness of emotional life but, conversely, it is enriched through them and draws from them incentives.

The Central Committee Accountability Report to the 25th CPSU Congress states that we find in the best works of socialist realism written in recent years "evermore frequently and, above all, more profoundly, a response to the main and essential factors with which the country lives and which have become part of the individual destinies of the Soviet people."

They convincingly show the strength of the moral positions of contemporary art and the fruitfulness of the writers' daring. One can see how the morality of the characters stems from their patriotism and love for the homeland, coming from the depth of the centuries and becoming even stronger thanks to a socialist outlook. The long searches of generations and nations go through the moral topic which has combined such searches and has refracted them in our present. To us socialism, as was stated at the writers' congress, represents great construction both on earth and in the hearts of the people.

The 25th CPSU Congress marked a new stage of the tremendous project related to the training and education of the young builders of communism. The decisive principles here are the fatherly faith of the party and the people in the Soviet youth, and the understanding that in the mature socialist society a generation of young people has grown up, ideologically tempered and independent, capable of resolving the most important problems of the future, and able to determine the future of the development of society. These are people profoundly aware of their responsibility to the people and to those who raised them.

"An important role has been assigned to you, the representatives of the young generation," said Leonid Il'ich Brezhnev in his meeting with the leaders of youth unions of socialist countries. He particularly discussed the question of the education of the new man--"the man who accepts our socialist ideology, gives the example in the political and moral respects, and is loyal to the ideals of socialism and communism."

As to the education of the young writers, here it is important to maintain comprehensively its lively interest in contemporary problems and in the solution of the most difficult artistic problems, entirely relying on these founding principles. The young writers must be helped to correlate their creative aspirations with reality and with the noble aspirations of our entire society. The molding of a Marxist-Leninist outlook among the youth is inseparable from the further strengthening of relations among creative generations of Soviet literary workers, or from the ideological and artistic demands facing all literature. The mastery of professional skill, in this case, means the creative mastery by the young artist of the experience of domestic and world culture, and the development of a truly original creative individuality and personality as an artist.

"We are pleased that the young generation of our creative intelligentsia is entering life evermore confidently," states the Central Committee Accountability Report to the 25th CPSU Congress. Riding the wave of a general attention paid to young people, characteristic of today, of late the Soviet literary workers have done a great deal in this respect. Problems of the involvement of young people in active social life were considered, along with the rejuvenation, through the young people, of the elective organs of the writers' union, and of the editorial boards of literary journals; the experience of all-union conferences and creative seminars for young writers and of their encounters with masters of the arts, as well as the work of numerous literary circles and studios, and of the Institute of Literature imeni A. M. Gor'kiy, the only training institution of its kind in the world, was summed up; particular mention was made of strengthening the traditional relations between writers and the Leninist Komsomol, the involvement of young literary workers in the life of great labor collectives and in the heroic new construction sites of today, of regular creative reports to readers, the publication of special series of books and collections by young writers, the setting up of a council for work with young writers, and the duty of literary masters to the youth, and of their particular type sponsorship which combines maximal exactingness and principled strictness with deep respect for the new creative generation.

The CPSU Central Committee decree "On Work With Creative Youth" was as though an answer given to the profound expectations of the artistic public. This document offered a deep analysis of the state of affairs and earmarked broad and promising ways for the ideological and artistic development of the young creative intelligentsia. The decree met with the warm response of the writers immediately following its publication, encouraging the burst of creative efforts, awakening new impulses in the training and upbringing of young writers.

This theme was expressively voiced in the report submitted by F. Kuznetsov at the recent plenum of the board of the Moscow Writers Organization which discussed especially literature by young people and its interpretation by our critics; problems of work with creative youth were comprehensively considered at the all-union conference of heads of writers' organizations in the country and chief editors of literary publications who met to discuss the vital tasks related to the decisions of the 25th CPSU Congress and the party's Central Committee decree "On the 60th Anniversary of the Great October Socialist Revolution."

Whether discussing problems of the reinforcement of the creative ranks, the quality and effectiveness of creative work, conceived in their broadest possible aspect, a literary summation of a process or an innovational search in the area of form and content, all this is inseparably linked in literary practices with the maturity of a talent. Let us recall how highly talent was placed in the Central Committee Accountability Report: "We well know that the artistic word, the flows of colors, the expressiveness of stone, and the harmony of sounds inspire our contemporaries and pass on into the hearts and souls of our descendants memories of our generation, and our times, with their troubles and accomplishments."

Our literary and artistic criticism and literary theory must sacredly cultivate this pathos, this Leninist style, in addressing themselves to the spiritual values and their creators. It is important for their prestige to grow ever-further along with their practical influence on writers and readers, so that such criticism and theory may judge more operatively and accurately the new and essential aspects which are developing in the life of the arts and of the people. The familiar CPSU Central Committee decree on literary-artistic criticism set as its main task to enhance even further its role in the overall development of artistic culture and the aesthetic education of the masses, and the spiritual life itself of the people.

How does the Soviet creative public see specifically the solution of this problem? In the ability of the critics to formulate vital questions in a party principled way. The critics must not simply "comment" about literature but study it, see each phenomenon in the living light of our time and the spiritual needs of our contemporaries. Literary criticism must be based on a solid Marxist foundation. It needs a truly scientific methodology and an overall concept of the development of art and society. It is precisely this that would protect such criticism from the troubles of subjectivism and lack of objective criteria and from a simplistic approach to artistic phenomena, directing it, above all, toward the new problems which imperatively arise with the development of life and art. Relying on the living artistic experience of Soviet multinational literature, our critics must, together with the literary experts, as one of its combat detachments, engage in the active elaboration of problems of Marxist-Leninist aesthetics and of the creative foundations of socialist realism.

We could confidently say that everything significant and theoretically interesting in the work of the writers' forum was nothing but the creative and constructive intensification of our knowledge of socialist realism and of the Marxist-Leninist methodology of the science of literature.

One of the characteristic results of this collective writers' judgment is the idea of the victorious assertion of socialist realism, this supreme manifestation in the aesthetic development of mankind. It is the thought of the tremendous vitality of our creative method, the nobility of its humanistic aspirations, and the ability to meet the most vital spiritual demands of the contemporary revolutionary epoch. The aesthetics of socialist realism fructifies the various genres and entire literatures. Its specific principles of party-mindedness and nationality and conscious historicism determine the birth of real artistic values and trigger an innovative spirit.

The decisions of the 25th CPSU Congress have been exceptionally fruitful in terms of theoretical thinking and creative practice. Speaking of the party's course, earmarked at that congress, Leonid Il'ich Brezhnev emphasized that "it is directed toward the solution of the most topical problems facing the country and affecting the interests of every Soviet person." The congress has entered the life and creative destiny of each one of us. It is one of these events through which mankind records its time and progress.

5003

CSO: 1802

THE FINAL ACT AND THE STRUGGLE FOR DETENTE

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 5, Mar 77 pp 85-95

[Article by Yu. Vladimirov and V. Osyanin]

[Text] Twelve months have passed since the leaders of 33 European countries, the United States and Canada, meeting in Helsinki, sealed by their signatures the Final Act of the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe--an accord governing a broad range of problems pertaining to strengthening peace and developing equal and mutually profitable relations among the participating countries. Convened on the initiative of the Soviet Union and other members of the socialist comity, the European conference became an event of tremendous international significance. It drafted the necessary political conclusions on World War II, collectively consolidated the inviolability of the existing borders, and confirmed the sterility and harmfulness of the "from a position of strength" policy and the cold war policy. The Helsinki meeting opened up new possibilities for solving the main problem of our time--the elimination of the threat of another world war. The conference elaborated a code of principles--the main rules and norms governing peaceful, friendly relations among the 35 participating countries. The main conclusion to the effect that a nation's people, and they alone, have the sovereign right to solve their own problems and to establish their own laws, and that no one has the right to dictate another nation's organization of its internal affairs, was most definitely ratified.

The participants in the Helsinki conference stressed their interest in efforts to reduce military confrontation and to contribute to disarmament. They expressed the conviction effective measures are needed in these areas, measures which in scale and nature would constitute steps toward the final achievement of universal and total disarmament under strict and effective international control, resulting in the consolidation of peace and security throughout the world.

On the initiative of the Soviet Union, a number of measures to strengthen trust in the military area were elaborated. The core of these measures involves providing advance information on major military exercises, the parameters of which were clearly stipulated in the Final Act.

The participating countries emphasized their deep conviction in the need to make the nonuse of force an effective international law. It was clearly stated that the countries will use all appropriate means to contribute to the creation of an atmosphere of trust and respect among nations.

The directions and specific forms of cooperation were formulated in the areas of trade and economy, science and technology, and environmental protection. Prerequisites were established for expanded cooperation in exchanges in the fields of culture, education, and information, contact among people, institutions and organizations.

The Final Act is rich in content. It would be impossible to encompass it within the narrow limits of a single account. The concept of detente is the pivotal point of each part and stipulation of the document. It is the principle means, the path leading to security and expanded cooperation. Its importance was singled out and emphasized as early as the introductory portion of the Final Act, which says that the countries participating in the conference are firmly resolved to broaden and deepen the process of detente and to make it aggressive and durable. "Soberly assessing the deployment and dynamics of various political forces in Europe and throughout the world," said Comrade L. I. Brezhnev in his 31 July 1975 Helsinki address, "the Soviet Union is firmly convinced that the powerful currents of detente and equal cooperation, which have been determining the currents in European and world politics to an ever greater extent in recent years, will, thanks to the conference and its results, gain new strength and an even greater scope."

To the USSR, detente is a natural element of its policy, stemming organically from the course toward strengthening peace and security pursued by the CPSU, and the assertion of the principles of peaceful coexistence among countries with different social systems. The foreign political activities of our country and of the fraternal socialist states are being pursued under the banner of adamant struggle for international detente, and they are structured to broaden, deepen and extend it to all parts of the world.

Our approach to implementing the Final Act is set forth in the address by Comrade L.I. Brezhnev to the Helsinki conference, in the CPSU Central Committee Accountability Report to the 25th Party Congress, in the Central Committee general secretary's interview on French television and in his speeches to the October 1976 CPSU Central Committee Plenum, in Tula (January 1977), and to the 16th USSR trade unions congress, the addresses to the United Nations by A. A. Gromyko, CPSU Central Committee Politburo member and Minister of Foreign Affairs, and in a number of other party and state documents.

Immediately after the conference, the Soviet Union, like the fraternal socialist countries, embarked upon the path of strict observance and implementation of the Helsinki agreements. The socialist states, which participated in the conference and made a tremendous contribution to its success,

jointly expressed their common view of the need to implement these agreements completely, embodying the Helsinki agreements in specific actions in the political field, in promoting trust, and in matters of economic and cultural cooperation. Their firm intention to observe all stipulations of the Final Act, representing a single entity, was repeatedly asserted in the course of bilateral and multilateral talks among the leaders of the fraternal countries. "We expect," Comrade L. I. Brezhnev said at the 25th CPSU Congress, "the same approach on the part of all the other participants in the European conference."

In the initial months after the conference, as a result of talks held by Soviet and fraternal socialist country leaders with Western government leaders, a coordinated approach to implementing the Final Act was developed, based on the content of the document itself. The achievement of mutual understanding in this matter is a success for the policy of detente and a major step toward implementing the Helsinki agreements.

Important stipulations were codified in the 17 October 1975 Soviet-French declaration signed in Moscow by L. I. Brezhnev, CPSU Central Committee general secretary, and V. Giscard d'Estaing, president of France. The Soviet Union and France resolved to strictly observe and implement the principles of relations among nations set forth at the European conference in all areas of their mutual relations. The strict observance of these principles by all the participating countries was to strengthen peace in Europe. The intention to fully implement all Final Act stipulations was also expressed. The declaration emphasized that the results of the conference are considered by the Soviet Union and France as a long term program for action. A similar approach to implementing the Helsinki agreements was reflected in the agreements reached by Soviet leaders with government leaders of Italy, Portugal, Britain, Turkey, Belgium, Denmark and other countries participating in the conference.

Mutual understanding in such matters is very important in counteracting the forces in the West which are attempting to interpret the Final Act arbitrarily, giving a one-sided nature to its implementation, violating the balance of interests it calls for, and acting as judges or controllers of the implementation of the agreements, actually weakening the political significance of the conference decisions and undermining them.

Since the conference, specific examples prove that efforts to implement the Final Act became the principal of European political life. The principles and agreements in this document are reflected in intergovernmental agreements and accords and are having a beneficial impact upon international life.

The USSR and the fraternal socialist states are providing an example of the conscientious and systematic implementation of the results of the conference. They are in the vanguard of this major effort, showing constant initiative, persistence, and a constructive approach. The Soviet Union formulated a number of proposals on the most important international problems, with a view

to realizing detente, adding military to political detente, reducing military confrontation, limiting the arms race and reducing the threat of war. The Soviet proposal for a world treaty on the nonuse of force in international relations, which won broad international support and was approved by the overwhelming majority of the members of the United Nations, is fully consistent with the Final Act. Our country has formulated important initiatives, such as the proposal that the development of new types of mass destruction weapons systems be banned, and the proposal for a total and universal ban on nuclear weapons tests.

At the 31st UN General Assembly, the USSR submitted a concrete, realistic, broad and comprehensive program for disarmament, set forth in the memorandum on ending the arms race and disarmament. Some forces in the West are continuing the arms race, increasing the means of mass destruction and supercharging the war psychosis. They zealously speculate on the fear which they themselves create with false claims of the "Soviet menace." Meanwhile, there are other forces in the West that can see the truth. There are serious politicians who reject fabrications about the danger of some sort of "Soviet aggression."

The struggle against the armaments race has currently become particularly topical. The Soviet Union, on the basis of the positive results already achieved in eliminating the threat of a nuclear war and in disarmament, favors a serious undertaking to reduce armaments, progressing step by step toward universal disarmament, and making the problem the object of prime attention on the part of national political leaders. The conference of the Political Consultative Committee of Warsaw Pact members held in Bucharest in November 1976 established new levels to be reached in consolidating peace and European detente and security. The socialist states called for the conclusion of a treaty among all the signatories of the Final Act, according to which no one would be the first to use a nuclear weapon. Without question, the implementation of this proposal would play a major role in weakening the threat of nuclear war and in further improving the entire international political climate. Even though the December 1976 NATO Council session proclaimed its lack of interest in the proposal, the facts show that this was far from a unanimous view. It is known that some NATO circles are interested in continuing an exchange of views on specific measures in order to weaken military confrontation and aid disarmament, which would intensify political detente in Europe and strengthen the security of European countries.

"Our appeal," stressed A. A. Gromyko, in his 17 January speech in honor of E. Wojtaszek, Minister of Foreign Affairs of the Polish People's Republic, "remains addressed to all the countries which participated in the Helsinki agreements, large or small, members of groups or not. In launching it the socialist states were and are guided by a single objective--contributing to the intensification of detente and strengthening peace throughout the world.

On the whole, the Soviet Union values the accomplishments since the European conference. The period just past confirmed the realistic nature of the program for basic political agreements on intensifying detente, strengthening security and peace, and energizing overall cooperation. One could confidently say that thanks to the conference, Europe has reached a more stable level. Addressing the 16th USSR Trade Union Congress on 21 March, Comrade L. I. Brezhnev pointed out that "within that time, peace in Europe was strengthened while economic, cultural and other relations and contacts among countries became noticeably broader and richer."

Our country values the support of the leaders of France, the FRG, Italy, and Great Britain for the policy of detente and peaceful coexistence. The meeting in Helsinki provided an impulse for the developments of bilateral relations between participating countries. The spirit of the Helsinki agreements has been reflected in intergovernmental documents such as the Soviet-American treaty on underground nuclear tests for peaceful purposes, the Soviet-French agreement on warning in the event of accidental or unauthorized use of nuclear weapons, and the agreements recently concluded on various matters with Canada, Cyprus, Portugal, France, Finland, Belgium, Turkey and other countries. Political consultations and contacts are broadening and new types of cooperation are being created.

After the European conference, the volume of foreign trade between the Soviet Union and the Western countries increased and scientific and technical relations broadened.

For example, compared with 1974, the year before the conclusion of the Final Act, total USSR foreign trade was up by approximately 40 percent by 1976, totaling 56.8 billion rubles. Trade with France increased by 80 percent, that with Britain 38 percent, with the FRG 36 percent, and so on. Yet we cannot fail to note that the development of international trade is being hindered, as in the past, by the system of measures which discriminate against the socialist states and which exist in a number of Western countries. The Soviet Union favors the broad application of the most favored nation policy in international trade relations. The position adopted by our country on this is strictly consistent with the Final Act.

The Soviet proposals to rally the efforts of nations to resolve vital problems in the fields of energy, transportation and environmental protection on an all-European basis are well known; to this end the Soviet Union has called for European congresses or international conferences. This initiative is gaining ever greater understanding and support on the European continent, for it is very important to all nations in this part of the world.

In strict accordance with the stipulations of the Final Act, the Soviet Union issues notices of major military exercises and invites foreign military observers to attend. This is significant for strengthening trust among nations and for the creation of a more tranquil atmosphere in Europe.

For example, notices of military exercises to be held in the Transcaucasus and in the Petrozavodsk-Sestroretsk-Vyborg areas were sent to the conference participants. Observers from countries near the areas were invited to attend these exercises. They included Greece, Turkey, Finland, Norway, and Sweden. Military observers from Denmark, Sweden, Finland and Austria were invited to attend the Shield-76 exercises of the joint armed forces of the Warsaw Pact members held on Polish territory. Recently notice was given of military exercises to be held in the Kishinev, Odessa, and Nikolayev area.

The stipulations of the Final Act on broadening cultural and other relations and contacts and increasing the volume of information are being implemented consistently. The Soviet Union is working from the premise that under the conditions of detente, the development of such relations and contacts is entirely natural, assuming of course the strict observance of the principles of mutual respect for sovereignty and noninterference in the domestic affairs of other nations.

Our country is making a major contribution to the development of international cultural exchanges. We have expressed readiness to expand the many-sided cooperation in the cultural area in accordance with the principles and agreements of the European conference, and in the interests of better understanding among states and peoples. Scientific, youth, sports, and tourist relations, and motion picture exchanges with foreign countries are developing actively. A large number of agreements and coordinated plans and programs have been concluded for this purpose.

At present, the USSR maintains cultural relations with nearly 120 countries. In 1975 alone, over 6,000 concerts and performances by foreign artists took place in 92 Soviet cities. About 180 artistic collectives and groups from all 15 Union republics visited foreign countries.

Currently the Soviet Union is staging 129 works by Western authors, other than the classics, including 21 French, 35 American, and 15 Italian works. Yet very few plays by Soviet playwrights have been staged in the West.

In 1976, more than four million tourists visited the USSR, while three million Soviet citizens took trips abroad. In the next five years, the volume of foreign tourism will increase by no less than 50 percent. More than 34,000 foreign citizens are attending Soviet VUZ's; every year more than 17,000 professors, graduate and other students are sent abroad and the same number of foreigners are welcomed by our country.

In 1976, the USSR published about 1,500 works by foreign authors, totaling more than 60 million copies. The number of books by Soviet writers published in any Western country is only a fraction of the number of works by authors from each of these countries translated and published in the USSR. The Soviet Union adopted a number of measures to improve conditions for the professional activities of journalists. Some of these were unilateral while

others were based on agreements reached with the United States, France, Britain, Italy, and other Western participants in the European conference.

At the same time, however, the Soviet Union has pointed out actions by the authorities in capitalist countries with regard to Soviet journalists which conflict with the Helsinki agreements. This was seen in the protests filed against the arbitrary expulsion of the TASS correspondent in Washington and the rude treatment given other Soviet journalists in the United States.

We must emphasize that our country has created the conditions necessary for a safe sojourn and work by various foreign missions, including representatives of trading companies and banks, whereas all capitalist countries are not by any means insuring such conditions for Soviet establishments and representatives.

One of the most important factors in the activities of the CPSU and the Soviet state in implementing the results of the European conference is the systematic support of the basic principles governing relations among nations, as proclaimed in the Final Act. A vivid example of a profoundly substantiated and active approach to international affairs based on the Helsinki agreement can be found in the answers of Comrade L. I. Brezhnev to questions by PRAVDA's correspondent published on 30 July 1976 condemning the interference of some Western countries in the constitutional process of the Italian Government and in Italian domestic affairs, in sharp conflict with the Helsinki spirit.

The Soviet Union firmly rebuffs any attempts to interfere in its domestic affairs and in problems within the domestic jurisdiction of countries based on the farfetched pretext of "defending human rights." As we know, this past February the attention of Americans was drawn to some of their statements and actions which conflicted with the positive development of Soviet-American relations. The Soviets could say a great deal--and on the basis of facts--about the state of guaranteed human rights in the USA, thinking along the lines of capitalist exploitation, the unemployment affecting millions of people, racial discrimination, women's inequality, infringement on citizens' personal freedom, rising crime rates, and so on. However, it should be made clear that attempts to impose one's own views on another can only complicate intergovernmental relations and hinder the solution of important problems which can and should truly be subjects of realistic interaction and cooperation between the USSR and the United States. Incidentally, the United States and a number of other capitalist nations which participated in the European conference have not yet joined in international pacts on human rights.

Peaceful coexistence and constructive, cooperative relations can only develop fruitfully when they are based on mutual respect for sovereignty and non-interference in domestic affairs. The attempts of some Western circles to place the implementation of the Helsinki agreements by other countries under some kind of control are in clear conflict with the Final Act. It does not call for such controls. The U.S. congressional committee to "observe" the

implementation of the Helsinki agreements is nothing but a manifestation of the desire to interfere in the internal affairs of other countries, ignoring the principles of the Final Act. It is understandable that the socialist participants in the conference, and not only they, have firmly and unequivocally rejected any contact with such "controller." The visits this "committee" paid to certain Western European countries were criticized by the public there.

The activities of the mass information media in the Soviet Union are directed, in full accordance with the letter and the spirit of the Final Act, toward tireless and specific emphasis on the ideas of peace, friendship, and mutual understanding among nations and peoples, and the concepts of detente and cooperation. This line is being convincingly and vividly pursued in all international and domestic action by our state, and it has been reflected in a number of joint documents concluded with Western countries.

All of these are examples of the vast number of specific measures with a view to the implementation of the Final Act promoted by the Soviet Union. Giving great political significance to this work, the CPSU and the Soviet state are pursuing it on a daily and systematic basis. Currently it is made up of dozens of practical actions. They may not always be apparent. However, our country approaches them as constituting a party and state activity of exceptional importance.

The other fraternal socialist countries which participated in the conference are moving in the same direction. The declaration of Warsaw Pact members approved at the Bucharest conference of the Political Consultative Committee is convincing proof of their efforts in this area. The communist and worker parties of the capitalist countries of Europe as well, took a firm stand in favor of the implementation of the Helsinki agreements at the Berlin conference.

It is entirely natural that more has been done in certain directions in the activities to implement the Final Act, while the measures necessary along other lines are being implemented more gradually or are just being drafted. "Here," Comrade L. I. Brezhnev noted in Tula, "a great deal depends on the general situation in political relations among countries, or as the saying goes, on the level of detente." This latter phrase covers a broad spectrum of problems in international political relations, the degree of trust and mutual respect, and the ability to take legitimate reciprocal interests into consideration.

The results of the European conference are a thoroughly weighed balance of the interests of all participating countries. In this regard, the importance of adopting a particularly careful attitude toward them is obvious.

Apparently, however, such an approach does not suit everyone in the West. There are forces which are attempting to emasculate and distort the very essence of the Final Act adopted in Helsinki, and to use it as a screen to interfere in the internal affairs of the socialist countries, and for

anticommunist and anti-Soviet cold war style demagoguery. This is the position of the enemies of detente and advocates of increasing tension: stepping up the arms race and creating an atmosphere of distrust and hostility among nations.

Naturally the activities of these forces are directed primarily against the active peaceful policy pursued by the Soviet Union and the other socialist states. But they are also aimed at the realistic-minded Western circles favoring detente, and, more broadly, at those Western leaders who have expressed their support for the European conference and have signed the Final Act.

This applies to those who favor a return to the cold war and tension--forces to be found in the United States, the FRG, and other countries, and those who would like to take the very concept of detente out of the glossary of political life, and who opposed the convening of a European conference.

These people were recently described quite accurately in the West German Bundestag by H. Schmidt, FRG chancellor: "Those who speak today about their disappointment are those who, prior to the Helsinki conference, consistently urged us not to undertake this new beginning."

These are the forces who would like to involve France in the military organization of the North Atlantic Pact again, and lead it away from the path of independence.

Poisoning the international atmosphere, the enemies of detente are hindering the implementation of the Final Act. The aspiration of the mass communications media in the capitalist countries to inflate polemics concerning this document is nothing but an attempt to undermine faith in something created through the joint effort of 25 countries, representing their common achievement, and to hinder the positive processes initiated by the European conference. The methods used in this connection are not original. Specifically, it is a matter above all of imposing a false idea of the content of the Final Act on the public and then building a campaign, on the basis of this improper image, on something which is not found in the Helsinki agreements. The fact that the Final Act and its content were not publicized broadly and completely enough among the peoples in the capitalist countries contributes to this unseemly operation.

The favorite topic in Western propaganda is the so-called third basket, or, in the language of the Final Act, that part of the document pertaining to cooperation in humanitarian and other areas. It covers such sectors of cooperation as culture, education, contact among people, and information. What is the nature of this portion? Is it in conflict with the political content of the Final Act as a whole? Do the stipulations in it pursue some special purpose outside the general context of the document? Such questions arise unwittingly in connection with the flood of disinformation on this part of

the Helsinki agreements. The Final Act contains clear answers to these questions.

In the section on cooperation in humanitarian and other sectors, the participants in the conference formulated a coordinated concept for the development of relations in the fields of culture and education, dissemination of information, and contacts among people in the intensification phase of detente. This concept is the sum total of the basic stipulations which must be observed by the participating states in their international activities in some areas, and in the implementation of the specific provisions of this section. It is clearly stated in the preamble to the section, which begins by pointing out the desire of the participating countries "to assist in consolidating peace and reciprocal understanding among nations and the spiritual enrichment of the individual, regardless of race, sex, language, or religion."

Therefore, the purpose of the development of cooperation in the fields of culture, education, contacts, and information is to aid in consolidating mutual understanding among European nations, to serve the peace, and to help all peoples on the continent make more successful and efficient use of the spiritual values at their disposal.

That same preamble emphasizes that cooperation in such areas "must be carried out in full observance of the principles regulating relations among participating members, as set forth in the document." Let us turn to the document. It is a question of another section of the Final Act--the "Declaration of Principles for the Guidance of Participating Countries in Their Mutual Relations."

The list of these principles begins with the principle of sovereign equality and respect for the rights inherent in sovereignty. It stipulates that the participating countries will "respect their mutual right to freely select and develop their political, social, economic, and cultural systems, as well as the right to establish their laws and administrative regulations." The statement is extremely precise and clear.

Another principle--noninterference in domestic affairs--has been formulated perhaps more completely than ever before in international practice. First it is stipulated that "the participating countries shall refrain from and interference, direct or indirect, individual or collective, in the domestic or foreign affairs falling within the domestic jurisdiction of another participating state, regardless of their mutual relations."

These are the key concepts, the criteria, which establish a kind of framework for the activities of participating countries in implementing the measures the section on cooperation in matters of the so-called third basket provides for. Above all, it is the Final Act which most unequivocally sets up obstacles against the arbitrary use of its stipulations--all stipulations, in whatever section they may be found--to justify interference in domestic affairs or a disrespectful attitude toward the legislation of one participating country or another.

Stipulation of a general nature regulating cooperation among participating countries in the areas under consideration are also made specific in the introductory parts of each of the subsections in this part of the document, in the so-called mini-preambles.

Let us take the agreements dealing with contacts as an example. The efforts of the participating countries in this field are linked, in the Final Act, with detente, or rather the "measure" of the development of detente. It is emphasized that matters pertaining to this section "must be settled by the countries involved on the basis of mutually acceptable conditions." Finally, it is stated that it is a matter of adopting such measures as "they would deem suitable." All of this confirms the obvious truth that any recourse to the Final Act or any reference to its stipulations demands a responsible attitude toward that document. Otherwise, no one could claim to be convincing or conscientious. Those of the bourgeois commentators on "third basket" matters who give little thought to the pertinence of their references to the Final Act should bear this in mind.

Let us turn to another area--the realm of information. The introduction to the pertinent stipulations links the continuation of efforts with a view to achieving progress in this field "with the development of mutual understanding among the participating countries and the further improvement of relations among them." In light of this, it is entirely clear that the publications of the mass communications media in the bourgeois countries, whose aim is not rapprochement among the participating countries but the complication of relations among them, not the strengthening of mutual understanding among peoples but the fanning of suspicion and mistrust, conflict in both spirit and letter with the Helsinki agreements.

Cooperation and exchanges in the field of culture and education are also closely linked with the development of reciprocal trust and with further improvement in relations among participating countries.

All of these stipulations in the agreements dealing with cooperation in the humanitarian and related areas are ignored by those would like to present a distorted view of the Helsinki agreements. Perhaps this has its own logic, for, metaphorically speaking these stipulations rap the knuckles of those who yield to the temptation to impose their subjective viewpoint on other nations.

However, it must be completely understood that the Soviet Union will allow no one to violate the principles of sovereign equality and noninterference in domestic affairs in relations with out country, or to act against the interests of the Soviet people and the socialist system. This was declared most clearly once again by Comrade L. I. Brezhnev in his speech to the 16th trade union congress on 21 March: "...We shall tolerate interference in our internal affairs by no one and under no pretext." The USSR has always defended and will continue to firmly defend its sovereign rights, dignity and interests.

The concept of developing relations in the fields of culture, education, contacts, and information jointly elaborated by the participants in the European conference is a major accomplishment. This is the first time such a concept has been formulated and given a responsible attitude on the part of the countries involved; it could open up new possibilities for the development of cooperation in these important areas.

Having discussed briefly what is ignored or circumvented in Western propaganda in discussions of the Final Act, let us also say a few words about that which it claims to be "guided." The stilted thesis, according to which the "stipulation" of the Final Act on the "freedom of exchange of ideas" is being violated, is being used extensively. It is not by chance that we have put the word "stipulation" in quotation marks. The weighty reason for this is that the Final Act simply does not include this or any similar stipulation. This is a question of a fabrication on which a mountain of tendentious comment has been piled.

The Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe was an international conference; its agreements were formulated on the level of intergovernmental cooperation, and it is entirely logical that no ideological terminology was included in the Final Act. Ideological contradictions are not resolved by diplomatic talks but throughout the entire course of social development. The whole spirit of the Helsinki agreements is an acknowledgment of the insurmountable historical fact of the coexistence of countries with different social systems and different ideologies. "...It is crystal clear that detente and peaceful coexistence apply to intergovernmental relations," Comrade L. I. Brezhnev said at the 25th CPSU Congress. "This means, above all, that disputes and conflicts between countries must not be resolved by means of war, the use of force or the threat of force. Detente does not in any way, nor could it, replace or change the laws of class struggle."

Let us consider another question, this time pertaining to radio information.

Some Western countries are trying not only to justify but also to encourage subversive slanderous activities by such radio stations as Radio Free Europe or Radio Liberty, which in fact operate with CIA money and engage in unbridled propaganda against the Soviet Union and the members of the socialist comity. Such "radio voices" were created in the West in the cold war period, for the obvious purpose of creating an atmosphere of mistrust and hostility among peoples, providing the public with disinformation, and interfering in the domestic affairs of other countries. The agreements of the European conference place such organs of radio slander essentially outside the law. Nevertheless, some Western forces are taking up their defense, resorting in this connection to reference...to the Final Act.

What is the truth? It is that the Final Act contains a special provision on radio information. However, like the contents of the document as a whole, it is directly, and entirely and unequivocally directed against this type of

"radio voice." We quote the statement on radio information in the Final Act: The process of developing radio information, according to the Final Act, should proceed in such a way "as to be consistent with the interests of mutual understanding among peoples and the objectives stipulated by the present conference." This concept has been formulated quite clearly.

The activities of these subversive radio stations are a screaming violation of the Helsinki agreements.

These examples clearly illustrate the fact that the Final Act has an indivisible, politically integral content, and everything in all the stipulations, in whatever section they may be found, is linked with detente and with the advance of this process.

The Soviet Union takes as its basis the deep conviction that the Helsinki agreements--a broad program for future years and even decades--constitute a platform for the joint efforts of the participating countries to strengthen peace, security and cooperation in Europe and to eliminate the threat of war in this area. It is a platform on the basis of which the countries which signed the Final Act can exert a positive influence on the course of international affairs as a whole.

Currently the participants in the European conference are preparing for the Belgrade meeting--the first collective meeting of their representatives since Helsinki. The Soviet Union and the other socialist countries which participated in the conference are in favor of having a constructive and businesslike discussion among sovereign partners there. The principal content of the Belgrade meeting should be concern for European peace and security and the development of cooperation among European peoples. It is necessary not simply to summarize what has already been accomplished, but also to agree on certain specific recommendations and proposals on problems in further cooperation. This is how the Soviet Union sees the main tasks of the Belgrade meeting. Such an approach to the forthcoming meeting, which is consistent with the Final Act, will contribute to the launching of new efforts with a view to the development of the detente process in the future.

5003

CSO: 1802

DEVELOPMENT OF THE CLASS STRUCTURE OF BOURGEOIS SOCIETY

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 5, Mar 77 pp 96-114

[Article by Joseph Sleifstein, director of the Institute of Marxist Studies, Frankfurt am Main. Article based on a larger research project entitled "On the Development of the Social Structure of the FRG Between 1950 and 1970," carried out at the Institute of Marxist Studies in Frankfurt am Main. Whenever subsequent material offers the possibility, statistical data has been brought up to date.]

[Text] It is unnecessary to emphasize the significance of the thorough study of the class structure of society and of its changes in terms of the theory and practice of the class struggle. The socioeconomic conditions in which class relations develop, the social weight of the different classes and social groups, their internal structure and the changes occurring within them under the influence of scientific and technical development in recent decades cannot be correctly understood without such a study. The Marxist-Leninist classics paid very close attention to the study of the class structure, always emphasizing the importance of this study to the workers movement.

1. Theoretical and Methodical Foundations of the Study

Bourgeois economic science and sociology in the FRG -- a typical contemporary capitalist country -- was steadily attempting to present matters as though the Marxist-Leninist theory of classes and of the class struggle has become obsolete and that contemporary social reality has outstripped and refuted it. The bourgeois ideologues claim that the proletariat -- in the sense conceived by K. Marx, F. Engels, and V. I. Lenin -- no longer exists, and that today's capitalist society represents a "middle class society" and that remaining social disparities and income differences no longer give grounds for speaking of classes, class disparities, and class contradictions; naturally, some social strata and groups remain (within a so-called stratification model). However, there are no longer classes. In brief, the class nature of the present capitalist society is rejected. Whereas initially the tone on this level was provided by Anglo-Saxon positivistic sociology, starting with the mid-1960's, when

class conflicts, including those in the FRG, became sharper, some bourgeois sociologists tried somehow to link their interpretation of the social structure of society with real facts without, however, abandoning the struggle against the Marxist-Leninist theory of classes.

Our study is based on the Marxist-Leninist theory of classes as a structural part of historical materialism. Since the relation between owners and immediate producers is the basic relation in any class antagonistic society, its class and social structure could be understood only on the basis of this specific relation among respective basic classes.

For the capitalist society, and all its development stages, relations between capital and hired labor, relations between the bourgeoisie and the proletariat, form, precisely such a decisive class relation. It is only on the basis of this understanding that we can accurately determine the social condition of the remaining social strata and groups within the structure of any society. The formulation of the antagonistic basic classes in the capitalist society given by Lenin in 1919, and its criterion for determining the classes are precisely the starting point of our socio-statistical analysis of the class structure of the FRG and of its changes between 1950 and 1970.

One of our main tasks was to use Lenin's criteria in defining the working class -- the proletariat -- in the contemporary societies of economically highly developed capitalist countries. We tried to take into consideration all sides and elements of such a definition: place in the historically developed social production system, attitude toward the capital goods, position in the social organization of labor, and means for obtaining an amount of share of the social wealth obtained. Capitalist hired labor is the starting point for the socioeconomic definition of the working class in the contemporary capitalist society as well as its social groups and individuals. Marx and Engels pointed out that the working class is the product of big industry. As it developed, and as ever more numerous population groups become included in capitalist hired labor the factual subordination of the worker and the labor process to capital takes place. It is only in the course of this process of surmounting and suppressing historically obsolete and partially accidental forms of hired labor that manpower becomes a commodity in the full meaning of the term and acquires a fully developed commodity nature.

Classifying as working class one or another group of working people living on their wages, naturally, we should proceed from the basic definitions, namely, that the working class is a class which does not own the capital goods; it is forced to sell its manpower as a commodity; it supplies capital with unpaid added labor and, thus, is an object of capitalist exploitation. This is the basis for our conviction that we could classify as proletariat and as the working class of the contemporary capitalist society not only industrial workers engaged in material output and directly producing added value. Large groups of individuals hiring their labor are

employed in trade, services, and state administration, i.e., in areas which are not a structural part of material output. However, such categories cannot be excluded from the working class. In precisely the same way we cannot exclude from it workers employed by noncapitalist small enterprises, or else members of the proletariat who have remained unemployed in the course of a certain period of time. Elaborating the socioeconomic definition of the working class and establishing its boundaries, we must proceed, therefore, from the position of one or another group in society as a whole, a position determined decisively by the clearly manifested commodity nature of the manpower.

The socio-structural definition and, particularly, the definition of the class position of the white collar worker category, which has expanded relatively rapidly in recent decades, is somewhat more difficult. As we know, a variety of viewpoints have been expressed in Marxist literature on this problem. By the turn of the century, even the most developed capitalist countries had only small groups characterized by a higher cost of professional and general training, compared with the working class, for which reason they earned higher wages, rapidly reinforced from among the bourgeoisie and the petit bourgeoisie. In recent decades substantial changes have taken place in this respect affecting a large mass of white collar workers. Both from the viewpoint of the social sources of their reinforcement as well as the cost and level of their education, and the amount of their wages, presently they are in a position fully comparable with that of industrial workers. We should add, however, that like the industrial workers, they are experiencing the oppression of social insecurity which plagues every hired worker under capitalism and are experiencing ever more strongly the oppression of capitalist deficiency. They are coming ever closer to the condition of the industrial workers not only in terms of their attitude toward capital goods but the conditions governing the reproduction of their manpower and its exploitation. In the light of Lenin's definition of classes, the decisive socioeconomic facts, therefore, prove that they should be included in the working class.

This means that the socio-structural inclusion within the working class of one or another social group cannot be defined either by reducing the working class to industrial workers directly producing added value nor limiting the working class to workers primarily engaged in physical work. Marx unequivocally defined as the decisive aspect not one or another type of specific work but the exploitation of the manpower within the system of hired capitalist relations. In the course of the development of production forces and the growth of scientific and technical progress, particularly in material production itself, the ratio between the physical and nervous-mental energy expended by the worker has changed considerably. However, hired capitalist labor has remained. The increased number of white collar workers has also contributed to the strengthening of the groups of the working class primarily engaged in nonphysical work.

Naturally, this does not mean in the least that the official status of earning a salary is sufficient for classifying various social categories as members of the working class. This official status is extended today to cover managers, higher officials, engineers, economists, and others who cannot be classified in the least as members of the working class, for this would mean to neglect the special position of the working class in the social organization of labor. The implementation of management and control functions which, under capitalism, are inevitably of a double nature, since they serve not only the organization of the combined production process but capitalist exploitation as well, higher reproduction (education) costs and higher wages place such groups of wage earners outside the working class, turning them either into members of the middle classes living on their salaries, or members of the bourgeoisie.

On the other hand, the definition of the main class located on the opposite pole of the social spectrum, i.e., the bourgeoisie or the capitalist class, also requires today a consideration of certain characteristics related, above all, to the development of monopoly and state-monopoly capitalism. In the contemporary capitalist society monopoly capitalism has become the dominating production method while the monopoly bourgeoisie has become the ruling social stratum. It forms the center of bourgeois economic and political rule. Differentiations and divisions between the monopoly and nonmonopoly bourgeois strata have developed as well. The prospect predicted by Marx and now turned into reality of the ever greater division between ownership capitalism and function capitalism has turned relations between owners and managers into an important economic and social problem. Naturally, we know that many bourgeois and rightwing reformist ideologues and politicians have derived from this changed ratio the "end" of capitalist power. Naturally, this is not consistent in the least with reality. It seems expedient to us to characterize managers, particularly their higher stratum, as a group functionally related to the bourgeoisie or the monopoly bourgeoisie. Taking into consideration the process of the merger of the monopolies with the state, characteristic of today's state-monopoly capitalism, the group of higher officials and bureaucrats within the state-monopoly system should also be considered as a similarly developed and operating group of the monopoly bourgeoisie.

As to the middle classes, their evolution proves that the condition of this stratum in economic life and its social importance and possibilities for political-historical initiatives have been greatly reduced under the conditions of the developed capitalist countries in recent decades even though, today as in the past, they remain a noteworthy social factor. They are developing further and further in the force fields of the two main classes and the characteristics of their internal differentiation are based mainly on their position in terms of their relationship with such classes (or by virtue of one or another of their functions). Since the social importance of the middle classes is declining as a whole, while their dependence is growing, today there already exists no grounds whatever for speaking of a middle class. We should distinguish within

this social category independent agrarian middle strata; independent artisan middle strata (pure artisans, petty merchants, petty industrialists, and others); the intelligentsia; and the members of middle classes surviving on their wages.

While the old self-employed middle classes (whose essential social characteristics, today as in the past, are the use of their own labor and the possession of capital goods to a limited amount), as was predicted by Marx and Lenin, are experiencing a steadily declining share, the size of the intelligentsia and the members of the middle classes living on their wages has increased noticeably in recent decades. As to the individual belonging to the latter category, their existence is based on hired labor. Their position in the social organization of labor as well as the socio-economic system as a whole determines the particular position they occupy concerning the working class. In the course of the production and circulation process and the realization of the added value, they perform management and control functions within the state apparatus. Related to this objective social status are higher manpower reduction expenditures (education), higher income and, as a whole, a higher position compared with the working class.

The intelligentsia as well represents, under contemporary capitalist conditions, a particular social stratum, belonging to the middle classes. In its overwhelming majority today it subsists through wages. Only an insignificant share of the intelligentsia could be classified as members of independent liberal professions. Even though individual intelligentsia groups perform, professionally and socially, the great variety of functions, there is a general characteristic applicable to them, namely, the fact that the implementation of such functions is related to a higher level of education and professional training compared with the working class. The greater cost of their manpower reproduction is the material base for its higher price. This double social status of the intelligentsia, as a separate social middle class, is based on the fact that in the capitalist society the development of education and science -- in the historical sense -- represents not only an objective progressive function but is also a means for capitalist exploitation and domination.

Development of the Social Structure of the FRG (1950-1970)

To Marxist students of the capitalist countries, forced to depend on official statistical data, a socio-statistical analysis is no more than a means for bringing to light the supplied data from the viewpoint of a class analysis. This leads to the appearance of a number of difficulties and the need for certain reassessments, since bourgeois statistics is based on purely external characteristics (the official juridical labor status of those employed, professional differentiations, and so on) of individual social categories. The data cited below on the class and social structure of the FRG do not claim, consequently, to be totally accurate.

a. Growth of the Population and Its Social Differentiation

To understand the evolution of the class structure in the FRG in recent decades we should consider, above all, data on the growth of the population as a whole and of the economically active population in particular.

Table 1

(1) Год	(2) Численность населения (в тыс. чел.; в %)	(3) Трудоспособное население	(4) Численность занятых	(5) Лица, живущие на заработную плату
1950	50 336 100,0	23 490 100,0	21 621 100,0	15 226 100,0
1958	54 606 108,5	26 128 111,2	25 786 119,3	19 566 128,5
1967	59 948 119,1	26 196 111,5	25 906 119,8	20 896 137,2
1974	61 991* 123,2	26 754* 113,9	26 373* 122,0	22 518* 147,9

Key:

1. Year
2. Population size (thousand people; in %)
3. Active population
4. Number of employed population
5. Individuals living on their wages

Source: IMSE/2,5,98; WIRTSCHAFT UND STATISTIK, No 6, 1975.

*Based on data of the 1974 intermediary census on the number of military personnel estimated to be 480,000.

Table 1 shows that in the past 24 years the overall population growth was 23.2 percent while that of the economically active population (including individuals subsisting on their wages and so-called self-employed) equalled 22 percent.

We note through 1967 a fast growth of the population as a whole, and, particularly, of the economically active population which, however, obviously declined after that. Yet these data already clearly show the faster growth of wage earners (blue and white collar workers). While the number of people employed rose, as a whole, by only 4.75 million people, the number of wage earners rose by 7.3 million. This is a manifestation of an important socio-structural change and, above all, of the reduced number of self-employed middle classes and the growth of the working class.

The study of the class structure based on Marxist categories faces, as we mentioned, certain difficulties, for social-statistical data available in the capitalist countries characterize only the formal-juridical labor status (blue and white collar workers, self-employed, and dependents), and the classification of the population by profession, as well as the population structure based on skill, education, and income level, as well as classification into different economic areas. Therefore, Marxist analysis requires a certain reassessment of available data.

In the period between 1950 and 1970 (later data as yet unavailable) the share of the working class in the active population rose from 64.5 to 71.9 percent. In other words, it accounted for nearly three-quarters of the entire active population and, including known working members of worker families, almost three-quarters of the entire population. Therefore, in that period as well the trend predicted by Marx was confirmed: more capitalists or more large-scale capitalists on the one hand and more hired workers on the other (see K. Marx and F. Engels, "Soch." (Works), Vol 23, pp 627-628). This growth of the working class was accompanied by an equally fast decline in the number of self-employed middle classes (peasants, artisans, retail merchants, petty industrialists, and others): their share of the active population declined as a whole from 25.9 percent in 1950 to 15.4 percent in 1970, i.e., by over 10 percent. In the first place this reduction is the result of the reduced percentage of peasants during that period both in the active population (from 15.8 percent in 1950 to 7.4 percent in 1970), as well as the population as a whole. The process of proletarianization developed here faster than among other middle strata. Conversely, the share of the intelligentsia in the active population rose. Today the bourgeois and capitalist class accounts for slightly over 2 percent of the active population.

b. Working Class. Structure and Development

We include in the working class, in accordance with our interpretation, anyone who, according to official social statistics, is classified as a blue or white collar worker and who is forced to sell his manpower as a commodity; anyone whose manpower supplies capital with added product; anyone who participates in the production and marketing of added value; finally, reproduction conditions which are consistent with or substantially close to the reproduction conditions of the industrial working class which constitutes the nucleus of the working class as a whole. Differences in the numerical strength of the individual categories of the working class, in accordance with realm of employment and specific times of labor activities, are determined by the development of production forces and the overall reproduction process. We should bear in mind that a numerically small yet, in recent decades, steadily growing share of the active population, whose position is comparable to that of the working class in terms of economic conditions, is directly employed within the government system and in the administration of the state. Because of its social function this group is not part of the working class.

Table 2

Class Structure of the Active Population

(1)	Класс/Социальный слой	1950		1961		1970	
		1 000	%	1 000	%	1 000	%
(2)	Рабочий класс	15 151	64,5	18 326	68,2	19 412	71,9
(3)	в том числе:						
(4)	промежуточные группы	(895)	(3,8)	(1 523)	(5,7)	(1 802)	(6,7)
(5)	Группы рабочего класса, занятые в аппарате власти и управления ^г	194	0,8	689	2,6	998	3,7
(6)	Средние слои, живущие на заработную плату	1 305	5,6	1 184	4,4	1 048	3,9
(7)	Интеллигенция в целом	-	-	656	2,5	819	3,0
(8)	а) Интеллигенция, живущая на заработную плату ^а	-	-	560	2,1	699	2,6
(9)	б) Самостоятельно занятая интеллигенция ^б	-	-	96	0,4	120	0,4
(10)	Самостоятельно занятые средние слои в целом ^в	6 081	25,9	5 323	19,8	4 155	15,4
(11)	а) Самостоятельно занятые сельскохозяйственные средние слои	3 703	15,8	2 802	10,4	2 004	7,4
(12)	в том числе: полупролетарии . .	(738)	(3,1)	(896)	(3,3)	(456)	(1,7)
(13)	б) Самостоятельно занятые ремесленные средние слои . .	2 378	10,1	2 521	9,4	2 151	8,0
(12)	в том числе: полупролетарии . .	-	-	(698)	(2,6)	(599)	(2,2)
(14)	Класс капиталистов	758	3,2	698	2,6	579	2,1
(15)	Трудоспособное население ^г . .	23 489	100,0	26 876	100,0	27 011	100,0

Key:

- | | |
|--|--|
| 1. Class/social stratum | 10. Self-employed middle classes as a whole |
| 2. Working class | 11. а) Self-employed agricultural middle classes |
| 3. Including | 12. Including semi-proletarians |
| 4. Intermediary groups | 13. б) Self-employed artisan middle classes |
| 5. Working class groups employed within the governmental and administrative apparatus ⁴ | 14. Capitalist classes |
| 6. Middle classes, wage earners | 15. Active population ⁴ |
| 7. Intelligentsia as a whole | |
| 8. а) Wage-earning intelligentsia ¹ | |
| 9. б) Self-employed intelligentsia ² | |

Estimates of the Institute of Marxist Studies.

1. The figure for 1950 included in the "Wage-Earning Middle Classes."
2. The figure for 1950 included in the "Self-Employed Artisan Middle Classes."
3. Figures for 1961 and 1970 exclude self-employed intelligentsia.
4. Including military servicemen.

Table 3

Working Class Structure by Socio-Statistical Group

(1) Социально-статисти- ческие группы рабочего класса	(2) Группы рабочего класса			Изменения к 1970 году (3)	
	1950	1961	1970	1950 (= 100)	1961 (= 100)
	(4) в тыс. человек				
(5) Рабочие	11 967	12 878	12 608	105,4	97,9
(6) Служащие	2 730	5 025	6 493	237,8	129,2
(7) Чиновники	648	793	854	131,8	107,7
(8) Итого:	15 345	18 696	19 955	130,0	106,7

Key:

- | | |
|--|-------------------------|
| 1. Socio-statistical working class group | |
| 2. Working class groups | |
| 3. Changes by 1970 | 6. White collar workers |
| 4. Thousand people | 7. Employees |
| 5. Blue collar workers | 8. Total |

Remark: Data on the active share of the working class in this table also include groups employed within the state machinery (excluding military servicemen) whose economic position is that of the working class.

As to the internal division of the working class into socio-statistical groups, the data of Table 3 show that the overall growth of the working class between 1950 and 1970 may be explained, above all, by the fast growth in the number of white collar workers. Even though, as in the past, compared with the other groups, blue collar workers accounted for a considerably higher percentage of the working class, their share declined from 78 percent in 1950 to 63.2 percent in 1970, whereas the share of white collar workers rose within the same period from 17.8 to 32.5 percent. These changes are due both to changes in the area of material output (specifically the increased percentage of industrial white collar workers), as well as the rapid expansion of economic areas (trade, credit, insurance, services, state administration) which employ a particularly large number of white collar workers.

The classification of the working class by nature of employment in various economic areas (see Table 4) proves that, as in the past, industrial workers account for the biggest group within the working class as a whole and are its nucleus. This explains not only their position in the central areas of material output and the main units within the capitalist exploitation mechanism but also the level of their concentration, high level of organization, and traditions in the labor movement. Added to the industrial workers the groups of workers most closely related to them -- construction workers and workers in areas such as transportation and

communications -- despite a slight relative decline in their number in the 1960's, these three groups account today for 45.6 percent of the overall strength of the working class. Such data also prove that in the past decades the growth of blue and white collar workers in trade (among the latter 67 percent are women) and of white collar technicians have been the fastest of all social groups belonging to the working class. The number of white collar technicians increased particularly rapidly between 1950 and 1970. By white collar technicians we mean a specific type of producers distinguished by a primarily nonphysical type of work which will grow in the future with the development of scientific and technical progress while, on the other hand, the employment of unskilled workers is declining and will continue to do so.

Data on the breakdown of blue and white collar workers in accordance with the size of enterprises employing them (Table 5) and by socioeconomic sector also show important trends of socioeconomic development. The breakdown by enterprise size indicates the high level of concentration of industry in the FRG and proves Lenin's assertion that monopoly capitalism remains surrounded by petty and medium capitalism.

According to 1970 data about 9 percent of the workers in industry were employed at small enterprises; approximately 38 percent were employed at small medium capitalist enterprises, and 13 percent were employed at bigger medium capitalist enterprises, while about 40 percent worked at big enterprises. Therefore, 53 percent of the industrial workers worked at enterprises employing over 500 blue and white collar workers. The employment concentration of white collar workers was even higher: in 1970 nearly 60 percent of all white collar workers in industry worked at enterprises employing over 500 people.

Statistical figures show that the share of small enterprises and of relatively small medium capitalist enterprises is particularly high in the technically less developed industrial sectors, food industry above all, whereas the concentration of employment (at big and more important middle capitalist enterprises) is the highest in the extracting industry (88.7 percent), raw material and fuel production (74.8 percent), and heavy industry (63 percent). Characteristic of these sectors is a level of production concentration higher compared with the employment indicator, since here the level of technical rationalization and of saturation with capital is considerably higher.

One of the consequences of scientific and technical progress is the trend related to the increased organic structure of capital of lowering the concentration of employment (with a considerable percentage of medium sized enterprises) and the increased level of capital and production concentration. These data also show that by virtue of objective reasons workers employed in the ore mining and leading sectors of the processing industry account for the most concentrated working class groups which, by virtue of this fact, have the highest possibility for united action in social battles.

Working Class Groups

Table 4

		(1)			(2)	
		Численность групп рабочего класса (в тыс. чел.)			Изменения к 1970 году	
		1950	1961	1970	1950 (= 100)	1961 (= 100)
(3)	Сельскохозяйственные рабочие	1 152	490	251	21,8	51,2
(4)	Промышленные рабочие (занятые)	4 158	6 674	6 471	155,6	97,0
(5)	в том числе:					
(6)	рабочие горнодобывающей промышленности ^а	956	651	380	39,7	58,4
(7)	рабочие крупных предприятий ^б	-	2 700	2 600	-	96,3
(8)	Строительные рабочие	1 542	1 675	1 608	104,3	96,0
(9)	Группы рабочего класса, занятые на государственном транспорте и государственной почте	743	809	767	103,2	94,8
(10)	Рабочие и служащие в сфере торговли ^в	1 330	2 140	2 361	177,5	110,3
(11)	Необученные рабочие ^г	2 885	2 726	2 556	88,6	93,8
(12)	Группы рабочего класса — торговые служащие ^д	2 338	4 122	4 780	204,4	116,0
(13)	Группы рабочего класса — технические служащие ^д	269	592	808	300,4	136,5
(14)	Рабочие в городах с населением свыше 20 тыс. чел.	4 835	5 816	5 905	122,1	101,5
(15)	в % от численности рабочего класса ^е					
(3)	Сельскохозяйственные рабочие	7,6	2,7	1,3		
(4)	Промышленные рабочие (занятые)	27,4	36,4	33,3		
(5)	в том числе:					
(6)	рабочие горнодобывающей промышленности ^а	6,3	3,6	2,0		
(7)	рабочие крупных предприятий ^б	-	14,7	13,4		
(8)	Строительные рабочие	10,2	9,1	8,3		
(9)	Группы рабочего класса, занятые на государственном транспорте и государственной почте	4,9	4,4	4,0		
(10)	Рабочие и служащие в сфере торговли ^в	8,8	11,7	12,2		
(11)	Необученные рабочие ^г	19,0	14,9	13,2		
(12)	Группы рабочего класса — торговые служащие ^д	15,4	22,5	24,6		
(13)	Группы рабочего класса — технические служащие ^д	1,7	3,2	4,2		
(14)	Рабочие в городах с населением свыше 20 тыс. человек	31,9	31,7	30,4		

Key:

1. Size of working class group (thousands); 2. Changes by 1970;
3. Agricultural workers; 4. Industrial workers (employed); 5. including;
6. Ore mining industry workers¹; 7. Big enterprise workers²; 8. Construc-
tion workers; 9. Working class groups employed in state transportation
and mails; 10. blue and white collar workers in trade³; 11. Untrained
workers⁴; 12. Working class groups -- white collar workers in trade⁵;
13. Working class groups -- white collar technicians⁵; 14. Workers in
cities with a population of over 20,000; 15. in % of the working class
size⁶

Institute of Marxist Studies estimates.

Notes: 1. Including power industry workers; 2. Enterprises employing over
1,000 people; 3. In data on size white collar workers include also middle
class wage-earners, white collar intelligentsia, and manager group;
4. Construction workers; 5. Absolute data for 1950=1951; 1961=1962;
1970=1966; 6. Active share of the working class excluding groups within
the governmental and military apparatus whose economic position is that
of the working class.

Table 5

**Breakdown of Industrial Workers (excluding trainees) by
Enterprise Size**

Отрасль промышленности	Год	Число рабочих без учеников (в тыс. чел.)	Распределение рабочих (без учеников) по размерам предприятий (в %)				
			10—19	20—49	50—499	500—999	1000 и больше
Горнодобывающая промышленность .	1960	520	0,15	0,67	7,66	5,22	86,31
	1964	416	0,16	0,65	7,45	6,77	84,97
	1970	252	0,21	0,88	10,19	8,12	80,59
Сырьевая и топливная промышленность	1960	1 354	2,63	7,34	28,10	10,85	51,07
	1964	1 351	2,91	7,46	27,97	11,05	50,62
	1970	1 310	2,62	6,37	26,71	11,52	52,77
Тяжелая промышленность	1960	2 279	1,01	4,25	33,03	13,79	47,91
	1964	2 519	1,27	4,54	32,97	13,60	47,64
	1970	2 799	1,25	4,32	31,65	13,97	48,80
Легкая промышленность	1960	1 614	3,02	10,55	55,52	15,93	14,99
	1964	1 623	3,75	12,07	56,96	14,70	12,53
	1970	1 592	3,47	11,00	57,50	14,21	12,81
Пищевая промышленность	1960	375	4,25	12,22	56,13	14,75	12,65
	1964	388	4,23	11,99	57,03	15,09	11,66
	1970	366	3,37	10,79	56,33	15,26	14,24
Промышленность в целом	1960	6 143	2,02	6,77	37,11	13,04	41,05
	1964	6 297	2,37	7,31	37,87	12,97	39,48
	1970	6 318	2,17	6,92	37,72	13,36	39,82

Key:

1. Industrial sector
2. Year
3. No of workers excluding trainees (thousands)
4. Worker breakdown (excluding trainees) by enterprise size (in %)
5. 1,000 or more
6. Ore mining industry
7. Raw material and fuel industry
8. Heavy industry
9. Light industry
10. Food industry
11. Industry as a whole

Sources:

1960: Die Industrie der BRD, Reihe 4, H. 30; Betriebe, Beschäftigte...
 Sept. 1960. 1964: Industrie und Handwerk, Reihe 4, Sonderbeiträge zur Industriestatistik.
 Beschäftigte nach Stellung im Betrieb, Sept. 1964. 1970: Fachserie D/4 (nach AsM, 6/1972).

A look at the employment of white collar workers in industry would reveal even more clearly the concentration process. Here the share of big enterprises has risen from 42.9 to 45.5 percent of the overall number of white collar workers.

Data on employment concentration, naturally, do not reveal by themselves the numerical breakdown of blue and white collar workers by different economic sectors, for big and monopoly capitalism factually includes today in its concerns a number of medium size enterprises.

A constant, even though relatively slow process of further employment concentration of blue and white collar workers is taking place within the capitalist sector. Yet the data in Table 6 also prove -- which is of great importance from the viewpoint of the trade union organization the political tasks of the workers movements -- that in a developed monopoly capitalism country such as the FRG a considerable percentage of blue and white collar workers remain, as in the past, employed at small and medium sized capitalist enterprises.

Table 6

Breakdown of the Working Class* by Socio-Economic Sector and Sphere

(1) Группа рабочего класса в секторе/сфере	(2) Численность в %			(3) Изменения к 1970 году	
	1950	1961	1970	1950 (= 100)	1961 (= 100)
	(в %)				
(4) Сельское хозяйство	8,6	2,5	1,2	21,8	51,2
(5) Домашняя прислуга	-	2,8	2,6	-	100,3
(6) Ремесленные средние слои	14,9	12,3	11,3	120,5	98,7
(7) Частнокапиталистический сектор в целом ^a	60,5	64,6	65,0	169,8	108,0
(8) а) мелкий и средний капитал	-	(41,3)	(40,6)	-	(105,6)
(9) б) крупный и монополистический капитал	-	(23,3)	(24,4)	-	(112,2)
(10) Государственный сектор ^b	16,0	17,8	19,9	196,3	119,6
(11) Итого	100,0	100,0	100,0	158,1	107,3

Key:

- | | |
|--|-------------------------------------|
| 1. Working class group in the sector/sphere | |
| 2. Size in % | |
| 3. Changes by 1970 | 8. a) Small and medium size capital |
| 4. Agriculture | 9. b) Big and monopoly capital |
| 5. Domestic servants | 10. State sector ^b |
| 6. Middle artisan strata | 11. Total |
| 7. Private capitalist sector as a whole ^a | |

*Only factually employed members of the working class, excluding the unemployed. a) Only the artisans without the capitalist sector in agriculture. b) Including military servicemen and FRG personnel in NATO forces abroad.

A number of important problems related to the technical development of contemporary capitalism and the nature of the work and educational level of the working class enable us to clarify data on the qualificaltional structure of blue and white collar workers (Table 7).

Table 7a

Qualificaltional Structure of Industrial Workers (in %)

	1951	1957	1968	1973
(1) Квалифицированные рабочие . . .	47,6	44,8	43,7	42,6
(2) Полуквалифицированные рабочие . .	28,0	32,4	36,6	36,8
(3) Неквалифицированные рабочие . .	24,4	22,8	19,7	20,6

Key:

1. Skilled workers
2. Semi-skilled workers
3. Unskilled workers

Data on the labor productivity of the different groups of both industrial workers and workers as a whole provide only a rather approximate picture. They show a reduction in industry of the more skilled as well as unskilled workers. However, such data conceal entirely the different skill levels of male and female labor. While the share of skilled workers has increased in the overall number of male workers, accounting for over 53.8 percent in 1974, among the women it dropped to 5.5 percent. One could not find more eloquent proof of the discrimination to which female workers are subjected in the modern capitalist society. The share of specialists among the men is, therefore, 10 times higher than among the women.

Table 7b

Qualificaltional Structure of the Working Class (in %)

	Мужчины (1)		Женщины (2)	
	1960	1974	1960	1974
(3) Квалифицированные рабочие . . .	49,9	53,8	6,3	5,5
(4) Полуквалифицированные рабочие . .	34,0	33,9	44,9	46,2
(5) Неквалифицированные рабочие . .	16,1	12,3	48,8	48,3

Key:

- | | |
|--------------------|-------------------------|
| 1. Men | 4. Semi-skilled workers |
| 2. Women | 5. Unskilled workers |
| 3. Skilled workers | |

Sources: StBA (Hrg.), Preise, Löhne, Wirtschaftsrechnungen, Reihe 15, Teil I, Arbeiterverdienste, entspr. Ausg; AsM 10—11/1975, S. 339.

Today the scientific and technical revolution is having a greater or lesser influence on the position of all working class groups. However, it would be erroneous to assume that it is already determining the structure of worker activities on a broad scale. Thus, according to 1969 statistical data, only 13.9 percent of all FRG workers were engaged primarily in the running of automated or semi-automated machines manufacturing finished goods, whereas 50.5 percent worked essentially without the use of machines or instruments. Even in key industrial sectors covered by automation approximately 30 percent of the workers were employed in the simplest possible monotonous operations, and only 21 percent of the workers were engaged in activities requiring higher skills and type of work.

As to the level of skills, we should consider above all trends such as the increased general educational standard and length of training (the share of graduates of secondary and vocational-technical schools among the young worker generation has risen). Furthermore, we note a natural adaptation of the workers to the requirements of the new technology and new labor processes, i.e., the type of training which does not cost the capitalist or the state anything. Finally, the vocational skills of considerable worker groups are depreciated in the course of capitalist rationalization (dequalification), as is confirmed by the reduced percentage of skilled workers in industry.

Also noteworthy is the comparison between the qualificational structure of blue and white collar workers which shows that here we could hardly speak of substantial differences in educational and professional standards, bearing in mind the considerable majority of white collar workers. This comparison also proves that approximately two-thirds of the white collar workers belong today to the working class. According to data of the mid-1960's 43 percent of all blue collar workers and 29 percent of all white collar workers were engaged in professional activities requiring no more than grammar education. The qualificational level of 96 percent of the blue collar workers and 66 percent of the white collar workers was limited to a certain period of training after primary school or a short period needed for mastering a skill and demanded no special vocational training. The corresponding share of this group among women white collar workers exceeds 75 percent.

The position of working class groups such as women and foreign workers is particularly difficult. In 1970 women accounted for 36.3 percent or 7.2 million people of the overall number of employed workers. Compared with 1950 this share rose noticeably in absolute and relative terms. True, the share of women blue collar workers declined from 69 to 48 percent, whereas that of women white collar workers rose approximately from 30 to over 50 percent. The discrimination which working women are subjected to is confirmed by their low educational standard and the fact that they hold jobs requiring lower skills and are considerably less well paid. Thus, women accounted for only 11.6 percent of all skilled workers in industry but also 40.6 percent of all unskilled workers.

In 1970 women blue collar workers in industry earned an average of only 61 percent of the wages of their male colleagues. Even within the same groups classified by labor productivity female wages are only two-thirds of the wages, for the same work, of their male colleagues. The same applies to women white collar workers.

Particularly heavily discriminated against are foreign blue and white collar workers whose number exceeded 2.2 million in 1972 in the FRG (it declined noticeably in the 1974/75 period of economic crisis), accounting for 9.2 percent of the overall number of employed workers. They possess no political rights whatever and are engaged, as a rule, in work requiring no training or minimal training. They live under extremely unsatisfactory housing conditions. In other words, they are subjected to a considerably greater exploitation than local FRG workers. In 1970 their share of the unskilled male workers in the FRG was 63 percent; they accounted for 31 percent of untrained female workers and only 6 percent of the skilled male workers.

c. Middle Class Wage-Earners

The middle class wage-earners are recruited from the middle and higher circles of white collar workers and employees. They perform control and management functions and work as specialists. As a rule, however, their level is considerably below that of the intelligentsia and the professional capitalist managers or the main group of bourgeois specialists employed by the state. They live basically on their wages. By virtue of their specific function in the social organization of labor, however, reflected in their wages, they are not part of the working class, they hold a somehow higher position.

It is entirely understandable that the statistical characteristics of this stratum encounter certain difficulties. Above all, they are quite closely linked with the lower groups of the intelligentsia subsisting on their wages (graduates of engineering schools) and the higher groups of the working class itself, i.e., those who, from the viewpoint of the decisive socioeconomic criteria, belong to the working class yet, from the viewpoint of their income and taking into consideration their control functions of a lower order, frequently exceed the limits of the working class. The boundaries here are quite flexible. Despite a considerable increase in the overall number of white collar workers as a whole and, particularly, of those who, by virtue of their socioeconomic status, are members of the working class, the overall number of wage-earning representatives of the middle classes remained relatively stable within the period under consideration. Increased employment in the state administration also led to a numerical increase in the group of middle class wage-earners. Their share rose approximately from 15 percent in 1961 to 20 percent in 1970. Since from the viewpoint of its social mentality this social group shares a number of features with the intelligentsia and, since, on the other hand, by virtue of its professional activities, it is

closely linked through a great variety of means with the lower groups of white collar workers and employees belonging to the working class, this group represents an important social and political force.

d. The Intelligentsia as a Special Social Middle Class

V. I. Lenin pointed out that the intelligentsia will exist as a special stratum for a rather long period of time even after the elimination of capitalism. This thought is the key to understanding the social status of the intelligentsia in the present capitalist society as well. Even though already now a trend may be noted of the transition of some of these groups, white collar technicians and some engineering personnel, above all, to the ranks of the working class, as a whole the intelligentsia should be considered as a separate social middle class. Available statistical data enable us to characterize only the key intelligentsia groups whose basis for existence is specialist qualification obtained as a result of higher education. Within the framework of the social organization of labor such groups perform, therefore, functions requiring a higher type of mental labor. We exclude from the intelligentsia as a specific stratum graduates of higher educational institutions who become capitalist owners or capitalist managers or else perform within the state monopoly system higher functions of power and acquisition. They account for approximately 15 percent of the overall number of factually employed graduates of higher educational institutions. Naturally, we should also bear in mind that the social categories are quite mobile: some graduates of engineering schools and higher specialized schools we characterize as members of the middle classes subsisting on their wages could also be classified as members of the lower groups of the intelligentsia.

The development of modern production forces brought about not only a greater need for specialists with the qualifications of intellectuals in the realm of material output (engineers, chemists, physicists, specialists in production organization and management, and trade and finance economists), but also rapidly increased the size and significance of the social realms related to manpower reproduction (education, public health, social insurance). As a result of this, the social share of the intelligentsia under contemporary capitalist conditions rose considerably.

Looking at the key intelligentsia groups, according to data of the end of the 1960's, approximately 55 percent were employed in the state sector, three-quarters of them in education.

A total of 30.6 percent of all graduates of higher educational institutions perform functions in education and training. Among all others the highest percentage of employed members of the intelligentsia is that of physicians, engineers, and individuals working in trade and in the organization and management of production. The number of members of the intelligentsia employed in science and culture rose particularly rapidly. As a whole, however, they account for only 5 percent of all graduates of higher educational institutions factually employed at present. Naturally, the social share of the intelligentsia, as a result of its activities,

Table 8

Basic Intelligentsia Groups

(1) Социальные группы	Трудоспособное население (в тыс. чел.) (2)		
	1950	1961	1969/1970
(3) Основные группы интеллигенции в государственном секторе	-	359	448
(4) — в частнокапиталистическом секторе	-	201	251
(5) — в сфере свободных профессий	-	96	120
(6) — в целом	-	656	819
(7) Выпускники высших учебных заведений	584 ¹	772	964
(8) Выпускники инженерных школ	183 ¹	-	398
(9) Выпускники профессионально-технических училищ (типа техникума)	-	1584 ²	2244

Key:

1. Social group
2. Active population (thousands)
3. Basic intelligentsia groups in the state sector
4. In the private capitalist sector
5. In the liberal professions
6. As a whole
7. Graduates of higher educational establishments
8. Engineering school graduates
9. Graduates of vocational-technical schools (technical school type)

Institute of Marxist Studies estimates.

Note. 1. 1957 data; base, 1950.

2. Including graduates of engineering schools.

and, particularly, as a result of its social influence on the broad population strata, is considerably higher than its numerical strength. This circumstance makes it a particularly important potential ally of the working class. The overwhelming majority of graduates of higher educational institutions and engineering schools works subsequently as members of the intelligentsia (87.4 percent). Of these, over 74 percent are wage-earners (white collar workers and employees) and only 13.2 percent are in the so-called liberal professions (self-employed physicians, lawyers, or artists). A total of 12.6 percent of graduates of higher educational institutions and engineering schools should be classified as members of the bourgeoisie and its groups by virtue of their factual activities.

As to a breakdown by economic area, most graduates of higher educational learning institutions are employed in education and training, science, and art (40.8 percent); 17.7 percent are in material production; 10.2 percent are in state administration or work for the government; conversely, over two-thirds of the graduates of engineering schools are employed in material output.

e. Self-Employed Agrarian Middle Classes

As we saw, in the two decades between 1950 and 1970 the share of self-employed middle strata continued to decline in the FRG. This particularly applies to members of the agrarian middle classes, i.e., the peasants. Within these 20 years 1.7 million people abandoned agricultural production; during the 1950's this affected above all owners of the smallest and the small peasant farms -- family farms not using hired labor. The intensive mechanization and chemicalization processes in agricultural output were characteristic of the decade of the 1960's, as a result of which the petty peasant enterprises were unable to acquire sufficient financial funds; the increased competitive pressure doomed to failure tens of thousands of small and medium-sized farms. The peasants they employed either became members of the proletariat or continued, on a partial basis, to engage in small-scale agricultural production as an auxiliary occupation.

As a whole, this process brought about profound changes in the agricultural social structure. Here most capitalist elements, the big farms, specifically, were reduced to the status of the self-employed middle classes, or middle class peasants, i.e., henceforth they conducted their output through the efforts of the family members without the use of hired labor. A considerable percentage of small and average peasants were forced to abandon agricultural production as the main source of existence. Table 9 shows the evolution of the social differentiation of the peasantry starting with 1950.

Table 9

Social Differentiation of the Peasantry (1950-1974; estimate)

Социальные группы (1)	Трудоспособное самостоятельно занятое население и члены семей (в тыс. чел. и в %) (2)			
	1949/50	1960	1970/71	(1974)
(3) Полупролетарии	0.738 18,2	0.893 29,8	0.456 22,2	0.344
(4) Мелкие и средние крестьяне . . .	2.965 73,1	1.900 63,6	1.548 75,1	1.166
(5) Крупные фермеры	0.342 8,5	0.196 6,5	0.051 2,5	0.039
(6) Крупные капиталистические предприятия	0.007 0,2	0.003 0,1	0.003 0,2	0.002
(7) Итого: . . .	4 052 100	3.001 100	2.058 100	1.551

Key:

1. Social group
2. Active self-employed population and family members (in thousands and in %)
3. Semi-proletariat
4. Petty and middle peasantry
5. Big farmers
6. Big capitalist enterprises
7. Total

This classification is based on the following data on the size of land-ownership: semi-proletariat: 1949, 0.5-2 hectares; 1960 and 1970, 0.5-5 hectares; small peasants: 1949, 2-5 hectares; 1960, 5-10 hectares; 1970, 5-15 hectares; middle peasantry: 1949, 5-20 hectares, 1960, 10-30 hectares; 1970, 15-50 hectares; big farmers: 1949, 20-100 hectares; 1960, 30-100 hectares; 1970, 50-100 hectares; big capitalist enterprises: 100 hectares or more. 1974 data have been borrowed (in absolute figures) from the intermediary 1974 census, and the percentage figures are based on the 1970 ratios. (WiSta, No 5, 1975, p 270.)

The strength of the various peasant groups indicated in the table was refined on the basis of the economic and technical changes which occurred in agriculture. As the table shows, in the period between 1950 and 1974, 2.5 million of employed workers abandoned agricultural production while the percentage of big farmers whose farms employed not only their family members but hired labor, dropped from 8.5 to 2.5 percent. Therefore, from the viewpoint of employment FRG agriculture became primarily an area for toiling and semi-proletarian peasants greatly dependent on banks and concerns supplying machines and fertilizers, and on food industry concerns who purchase agricultural commodities. Agricultural capitalists account for only 0.2 percent of the overall number of people employed in agriculture. Furthermore, they are concentrated mainly in forestry. Naturally, hired labor as well as the number of agricultural workers in the agrarian sector have declined considerably.

As to medium-sized peasant enterprises (according to our classification today they include farms not exceeding 50 hectares), they are serviced almost entirely by the peasants themselves and the members of the families, since the size of the land per fully employed worker has drastically increased as a result of the extensive use of machinery.

f. Self-Employed Artisan Middle Classes

We classify in this middle class category (artisans, retail merchants, small industrialists, and so on) individuals employed outside of agricultural production (in the processing industries, construction, transportation, trade, and services as a whole), not belonging to the bourgeoisie.

Their use of capital goods and the circulation of funds and commodity stocks at their disposal through them represent, from the socio-economic viewpoint, an insignificant amount of capital capable of further reproduction, enabling them to maintain a living standard clearly higher than that of the working class. This feature distinguishes the self-employed artisan middle classes from the petty capitalists even though here again the upper and lower limits of these groups are quite flexible.

PAGES 134 Table 10
ARE
MISSING
IN
ORIGINAL
DOCUMENT

Whereas between 1950 and 1970 the size of the agrarian middle classes declined by nearly one-half, the number of people classified as artisan middle classes declined by only 10 percent while their percentage among the self-employed middle classes as a whole rose from 39 to 52 percent. There was a clear drop in the number of auxiliary personnel in processing industries, i.e., above all, in the crafts, whereas in trade and monetary circulation, this share increased for the entire 20 year period and at least in the course of considerable segments of this period. As a whole, in almost all sectors there was a considerable reduction in artisan middle classes, even though it occurred at an uneven pace.

g. The Bourgeoisie

Table 11

Number and Structure of the Bourgeoisie (1950-1970; estimate)

(1) Социальные группы	Трудоспособное население / занятые (в тыс. чел. и %)		
	1950	1961	1970
(3) Функционирующие капиталисты-собственники	585 (77,2)	483 (69,2)	345 (59,6)
(4) в том числе: в сельском хозяйстве	349 (46,1)	199 (28,5)	54 (9,3)
(5) в промышленности	236 (31,1)	284 (40,7)	291 (50,3)
(6) Капиталистические менеджеры	151 (19,9)	187 (26,8)	200 (34,5)
(7) Группы буржуазии в государственном аппарате	22 (2,9)	28 (4,0)	34 (5,9)
(8) Капиталисты в целом	758 (100)	698 (100)	579 (100)
(9) Доля капиталистов по отношению к трудоспособному населению (с учетом военнослужащих)	3,2	2,6	2,1
(10) Крупная и монополистическая буржуазия . .	18 (2,4)	22 (3,1)	25 (4,3)
(11) Средние и мелкие капиталисты	740 (97,6)	676 (96,9)	554 (95,7)

Key:

1. Social group
2. Active population/employed (in thousands and %)
3. Functioning capitalist-owners
4. Including in agriculture
5. In industry
6. Capitalist managers
7. Groups of the bourgeoisie in the state apparatus
8. Capitalists as a whole
9. Share of capitalists in terms of active population (including military servicemen)
10. Big and monopoly bourgeoisie
11. Middle and petty capitalists

According to IMSF No 2, p 652, Tabelle 6/15.

As the data of Table 11 show the share of individuals officially classified in the capitalist class of the overall number of employed individuals continued to decline between 1950 and 1970. Today it accounts for slightly over 2 percent. The differentiation within the bourgeois class is the consequence of the different roles of productive and financial capital and the different functions of individual and associated capitals in the reproduction process of the overall social capital and, finally, the result of different amount of capital. Under the conditions of the present monopoly and state-monopoly capitalism, the division between capital-ownership and capital-function has assumed particular importance. This is manifested, above all, in the increased role of the social groups such as capitalist managers. We consider them here not only as the group functionally linked with the bourgeoisie, since most of this group has directly merged with the bourgeoisie, for its members earn their share of profits as a result of ownership as well, rather than only as officials and representatives of capitalism. While the number of capitalists as a whole and, particularly, of functioning capitalists-owners, has declined drastically as a result of capital concentration and centralization, the number and percentage of capitalist managers and of bourgeois groups employed in the governmental apparatus have increased considerably in the bourgeois class as a whole.

From the viewpoint of the social hierarchy of capitalism the division between monopoly capital (financial oligarchy), on the one hand, and the nonmonopolistic bourgeoisie (petty and medium capitalists), on the other, has become the main dividing line. According to our calculations, approximately 95.7 percent of the overall number of individuals belonging to the bourgeois class should be classified as petty and medium capitalists, whereas only 4.3 percent -- 25,000 people -- could be classified as members of the big and monopoly bourgeoisie.

The petty capitalists account today for approximately 55.3 percent of the overall size of the bourgeoisie; the middle capitalists account for 40.4 percent. The share of the middle bourgeoisie within the bourgeois class as a whole for the period under consideration has unquestionably risen for this group should include a considerable number of capitalist managers and bourgeois groups working for the government closely linked with them. As to the highest step in this hierarchy, i.e., the big and the monopoly bourgeoisie, we find here the clear manifestation of the process of merger between the monopolies and the state, one of whose manifestations is the special union and interchangeability of leading managers of capitalist concerns and leading groups of the state bureaucracy.

Table 12

Bourgeoisie (capitalists and closely related groups)

(1) Сферы деятельности и социальные группы	(2) Трудоспособное на- селение / занятые (в тыс. чел.)			(3) Изме- нения к 1970 г. (1950 = 100)	(4) Трудоспособное на- селение / занятые (в %)		
	1950	1961	1970		1950	1961	1970
Структура функционирующих капиталистов- собственников (по сферам деятельности) (5)							
(6) Сельское хозяйство	349	199	54	15,5	59,6	41,2	15,7
(7) Сфера материального производства в промышленности	163	178	178	109,2	27,9	36,9	51,6
(8) Другие сферы в промышленности	73	106	113	154,8	12,5	21,9	32,7
(9) Итого:	585	483	345	59,0	100	100	100
(10) Иерархия буржуазии							
(11) Крупная и монополистическая бур- жуазия	18	22	25	138,9	2,4	3,1	4,3
(12) в том числе:							
(13) функционирующие капиталисты-соб- ственники	1	1	1	100	0,1	0,1	0,2
(14) менеджеры крупного и монополи- стического капитала	15	18	20	133,3	2,0	2,6	3,4
(15) высшие руководящие группы в го- сударственном аппарате	2	3	4	200	0,3	0,4	0,7
(16) Средняя буржуазия	180	217	234	130	23,7	31,1	40,4
(13) в том числе: функционирующие ка- питалисты-собственники	24	23	24	100	3,2	3,3	4,1
(17) менеджеры и тесно связанные с ними группы ^a	136	169	180	132,4	17,9	24,2	31,1
(18) группы буржуазии в государствен- ном аппарате ^a	20	25	30	150	2,6	3,6	5,2
(19) Мелкие капиталисты	560	459	320	57,1	73,9	65,8	55,3
(12) в том числе:							
(20) в сельском хозяйстве ^b	342	196	51	14,9	45,1	28,1	8,8
(21) в промышленности	218	263	269	123,4	28,8	37,7	46,5
(9) Итого:	758	698	579	76,4	100	100	100

Key: 1. Area of activity and social group; 2. active population/employed (thousands); 3. changes by 1970 (1950=100); 4. active population/employed (in %); 5. structure of functioning capitalist-owners (by realm of activity); 6. agriculture; 7. material production in industry; 8. other industrial areas; 9. total; 10. bourgeois hierarchy; 11. big and monopoly bourgeoisie; 12. including; 13. functioning capitalist-owners; 14. big and monopoly capitalism managers; 15. higher administrative groups in the state apparatus; 16. middle bourgeoisie; 17. managers and groups closely linked with them^a; 18. bourgeois groups in the state apparatus^a; 19. petty capitalists; 20. in agriculture^b; 21. in industry

Institute of Marxist Studies estimate.

Note. a. These groups should be classified not only with the middle bourgeoisie; most of them are in the lower bourgeois groups.

b. Big farmers.

ETERNAL SIN OF BRITISH IMPERIALISM

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 5, Mar 77 pp 115-122

[Article by V. Ovchinnikov, Belfast-Strasbourg-London, March]

[Text] Belfast, January. A patrol of parachutists is walking in the city as in a town occupied by the enemy. Some stalk along the walls, submachine guns on the ready, while others cover them from shelters, making short rushes. In the middle of the street, as though not noticing them, women stand gossiping, holding shopping bags, while children are noisily crowding around. It is like a movie director's trick, both front and rear appear on the same film...

Strasbourg, February. The hall of the European Court. The guardians of the law sit behind the table in their black mantles. The bench of the country-plaintiff is on their right and that of the country-defendant is on their left. They are hearing the case of the accusation of Great Britain of violating human rights in Northern Ireland.

The Ulster abscess--this painful growth on the conceited forehead of British democracy--burst open in its entire scandalous unseemliness in the eyes of world public opinion. What happened to the rhetoric of the zealous defenders of civil freedoms on the banks of the Thames! London does not dispute the accusations leveled by Dublin. Yes, cases of prisoner torture have indeed taken place. But, the defendant claims, they mean little compared with the scope of the violence in Northern Ireland. In fact, in the eight years since British troops were sent to the autonomous province there have been 1,700 dead and 18,000 wounded. It is claimed that extreme measures have had to be taken to defeat terrorism...

"Northern Ireland has a population of approximately 1.5 million. Most of them are descendants of Anglo-Scottish colonists who settled there at the beginning of the 17th century. They are traditionally Unionists, i.e., supporters of retaining the union with Great Britain and, as a rule, belong to the Protestant community. The minority--approximately half a million people--are Irish in origin, Catholics, and, most frequently, republican in their political views, i.e., to one or another extent, they favor unification with the Irish Republic." This is the official figure, the official version of the background of the events.

I see once again the streets of Belfast: lights behind closed windows, bullet-marked walls, reciprocal threats voiced by warring sides. Posters posted by the British authorities which launched, since last autumn, a broad propaganda campaign under the slogan of "Eight Years Is Enough!" We can judge the response to this appeal by the white poster which reads "Eight Centuries Is Even More So!"

To determine the origins of the tragedy we should look at the distant past when, as Engels said, "It befell on Ireland to become the first English colony" (see K. Marx and F. Engels, "Soch" [Works], Volume 29, p 43).

It is noteworthy that the beginning of the British crown's overseas conquests took place precisely during the time that Adrian IV, the first and only Englishman in all history, was occupying the Vatican throne. It was precisely with his blessing that Henry II Plantagenet invaded the Green Isle in 1171. The Pope did not consider it a sin that the sword of the conquerors struck at Catholics. At that time the Irish Catholic Church was the only Western European church independent of Rome. Therefore, it was not difficult to find a reason for the bloodshedding. On the orders of Adrian IV and Henry II, the obliging theologian Giraldus Cambrensis concocted the "History of the Conquest of Ireland," in which he depicted its population as savage pagans, merely pretending to be Christians, treacherous, ignorant, idle, unrestrained, and pious but superstitious people. In subsequent centuries this writing became like an indulgence for the butchers of Ireland, creating a stereotype of prejudices needed by the colonizers to justify their crimes.

The stereotype turned out to be universal. It properly served the oppressors who referred to the will of the Pope as well as those who, subsequently, saw in any action against the English yoke "the long hand of Rome."

You will see in any Protestant tavern (taverns in Ulster are divided according to religion no less than churches are) a gonfalon depicting a horseman riding a white horse. This is William III of Orange, the idol of the Unionists, whose victory over the supporters of the Catholic James II Stewart in 1691 completed the project initiated five centuries earlier. The period of the conquest of Ireland was replaced by the period of its barbaric enslavement.

London does not like to remember that English slave traders supplied the plantation owners of the new world their livestock initially not out of Africa but of Ireland. By the middle of the 17th century over 100,000 men, women, and children were taken there.

The acts of "punitive laws" cut off the roots of the Irish economy and ruined its farmers, cattle breeders, and artisans. The peasants were deprived of the very right to land ownership. They could only lease the land for a short time not knowing when they would be expelled from their plots. The city artisans were forbidden to have more than two apprentices or to leave an estate. Despite the abundance of suitable ports for trade with Europe and America, Ireland was cut off from the world's foreign economic relations.

"Good old England" which had become used to priding itself with the inviolability of civil rights and freedoms dating just about from the time of the Magna Carta and boasting of its tolerance of different ideas did not allow the Irish to speak ~~in~~ their native tongue or open schools. A bounty was paid for the head of an Irish teacher in the 17th century, as for a killed wolf. The "punitive laws" were aimed at bleeding the country white and depriving the native population from access to knowledge and any professional career.

Ireland became the only European country whose population diminished rather than increased. Whereas according to the first official census of 1841 there were over 8 million people living on the island, today there are only 4.5 million (3 million in the Irish Republic and 1.5 million in Ulster). In other words, while the British population quadrupled in the past 150 years, the population of Ireland declined by nearly one-half.

"For centuries England enslaved Ireland, causing the Irish peasants unheard of tortures and death by hunger, expelling them from the land, forcing hundreds of thousands and millions of people to leave their homeland and resettle in America," wrote V. I. Lenin in his article "The English Liberals in Ireland." "...Ireland withered away and remained an underdeveloped, semi-savage, purely agricultural country, a country of poor farm hands" ("Poln. Sobr. Soch." [Complete Collected Works], Volume 24, pp 365-366).

Capitalist relations developed in England while in Ireland a system of slavery, and of gross national and religious discrimination and social illegality was created.

"White Britain and Black Ireland" was the eloquent title of a book by the American historian and sociologist Richard (Lebou) (published in Philadelphia in 1976). Its author, the preface states, proves the way the prejudiced image of the Irish helped the British to justify their system of domination and oppression in Ireland. The British convinced themselves that they were offering the only possible form of rule to a nation allegedly incapable of guiding its own destiny. The book shows the way the stereotype of prejudices, developed as early as the time of Henry II, is used to this very day like a fig leaf to conceal a shameful oppression.

All the journals and newspapers which, in all likelihood, were used by Marx, Engels, and Lenin, who dealt a great deal with the Irish problem, are found in the reading room of the British Museum. "The liberation struggle of the Irish people," recalls Michael O'Riordan, secretary general of the Irish Communist Party, "was a valuable material used by Marx and Engels in their elaboration of the theory of the national problem, so brilliantly developed subsequently by Lenin, and embodied in reality into a multinational state of a new type thanks to the establishment of the USSR."

If we believe the newspaper articles over 100 years old the Irish are not only to be blamed for their own poverty but, allegedly, do not suffer from it. "The Irish hate our blossoming island. They hate our system, our civilization, our enterprise, our freedom, and our religion. Such a savage,

thoughtless, idle, and superstitious nation cannot nurture a sympathy for the British character," wrote Benjamin Disraeli, the future prime minister of England, in the 18 April 1836 TIMES issue. "Is Britain to be blamed for the fact that the Irish prefer to eat potatoes instead of bread, or that they are capable of living under conditions which even pigs would not tolerate? Living in poverty generation after generation, the Irish have largely become insensitive to it," complained the same TIMES in its 8 December 1843 issue. The law-observing English petty bourgeois was taught, day after day, that the Irish have an organically inherent tendency to violence as though each one of them is a potential conspirator and delinquent.

Naturally, in London, including the House of Commons, throughout the centuries there were people who saw the British yoke as the real reason for the troubles of Ireland and who openly spoke of this. However, their lonely voices could not influence politics or even substantially affect a properly tuned public opinion. "We keep the Irish in darkness and ignorance and are then amazed at how they could be so superstitious; we doom them to poverty and adversity and are then amazed at their tendency to engage in disturbances and disorders; we tie their hands, depriving them of access to entrepreneurial activities, and are then amazed at their alleged laziness and idleness," said indignantly in 1778 Thomas Campbell, author of the "Philosophical Study of Ireland".

Ever new chains were hammered for the Irish. However, the people of the first British colony could not be totally conquered.

"I have come from Ireland, my lords, to tell you the following: The rebels have mutinied raising weapons against the English," says a messenger in the tragedy "Henry VI." One could hardly find in all of Shakespeare's works a replica which would have such a topical political echo on the British stage.

The national-liberation struggle assumed one or another shape but never quieted down. When under its increasing blows the colonial foundations weakened, British imperialism resorted to the policy of "divide and rule". In 1921 Ireland was divided by London in such a way that the heirs of the first colonists--the Protestants--who were a minority on the island found themselves in a majority position in its separated part. The imperialists cut off of the Ulster province six of the nine counties to establish an artificial formation--Northern Ireland--annexed to Great Britain. The organizers of this division aimed at setting against each other the working people professing different religions, in order to weaken their struggle against the power of the haves, channeling it into the bed of national and religious discord, constantly fanned hostility.

"The autonomy of Northern Ireland" is the most refined of all known forms of perpetuation of colonial rule. It enabled London to shift to Belfast the burden of ruling a restless area in which Unionists, whose class nucleus consists of big landowners and industrialists, used the double numerical superiority of the Protestant community not only to usurp the power but also to violate shamelessly the rights of the Catholic minority.

Throughout the existence of the autonomous province the 500,000-strong Catholic community has not been represented once in the local limited parliament, subordinate to the British authorities, nor the local administrative authorities in proportion to its numerical strength. The Protestants managed to find themselves in the majority even in cities and counties with a majority Catholic population. Derry is an eloquent example. It was divided into electoral districts in such a way that 17,000 Catholics could elect only eight representatives to the city council while less than 10,000 Protestants could elect 12.

Even after Northern Ireland officially stopped being a colony and became a structural part of the United Kingdom, property qualifications were retained on its territory for a full half a century. It deprived about 250,000 people of voting rights (mostly Catholics), giving several votes each to big real estate and capital owners (as a rule, Protestants). Flagrant discrimination based on religion remains in hiring and housing allocations. No single part of Great Britain suffers from unemployment as much as Ulster which, furthermore, has the lowest wage rate.

Even the ghostly set of democratic freedoms which the "homeland of parliamentarianism" so much likes to boast of has not been applied to Ulster. From the very first days of the establishment of the autonomous province its administration has been invariably based on repressive laws. The first among them, the "law on emergency powers", passed in 1922, kept effective for half a century, gave the police such broad rights to search and detention that as early as 1938, the British civil rights committee noted that "the Ulster system has no parallel in any country other than fascist Italy and Germany."

How is the fact that arbitrariness and illegality were turned into law on a certain portion of the territory of the United Kingdom? By virtue of that same stereotype prejudice. Let us read the 2 December 1846 TIMES editorial. It sounds as though literally discussing the 1973 "emergency situation law": "Everything which goes beyond the constitutional framework seems wrong to the British. The rights given by the law are usually sufficient to deal with any exceptional situation. It may seem cruel and unfair to recommend toward the Irish that which we would find unacceptable for ourselves. However, we shall be guided by circumstances. If the crimes are not British and if British means for blocking them do not work, why not use other, unBritish measures, wherever violence cannot be controlled?"

British democracy never extended to Ireland, either prior to or after its dismemberment. It was silently assumed that no ceremony was needed with the Irish; that there was no need to burden oneself in Ulster with the showy attributes of parliamentary democracy or the appearance of a free struggle among political forces; and that more primitive means would be suitable to deal with its people who thought differently. "The British condemn with indignation oppression in other parts of the world, remaining blind to its existence in their own back yard," noted sarcastically Professor (Lebou).

Indeed, many people along the banks of the Thames love to strike a pose as opponents of violence and arbitrariness, and as supporters of freedom and justice. How did it happen that in 50 years no one of them was able to notice that hundreds of thousands of his fellow citizens were deprived of basic rights and were subjected to discrimination and arbitrariness and excluded from bourgeois democracy?" No one gave the alarm, no one appealed for a crusade in the defense of human rights.

Furthermore, when toward the end of the 1960's a civil rights movement was launched in Northern Ireland, it was met by the authorities with bayonets in the literal meaning of the term. While saddened by Ulster's misfortune, the British liberal complains that the civil rights movement only led the masses to fire, allegedly triggering the vicious circle of violence which no one is able to break today. The liberal is too busy to think of the reasons for the events.

Ten years ago, in January 1967, representatives of various public organizations and trade unions set up the Association for the Struggle for Civil Rights in Northern Ireland. Those who participated in its first mass action--the Derry October 1968 demonstration--were savagely clubbed by the police. What is it that the people, victims of such reprisals, demanded? The following:

Elections based on the "one man, one vote" principle, and an end to gerrymandering;

The passing of laws prohibiting discrimination in hiring and housing allocations;

Abrogation of the 1922 "emergency powers law" and the disbanding of the militarized police--the "special forces B" (the lair of Protestant extremists).

All that the association demanded were respect for human rights, basic civil equality, and an end to discrimination and arbitrariness.

It would be erroneous to believe that in ten years of struggle we achieved nothing, I was told by Madge Davidson, association secretary, in Belfast. Above all our actions contributed to the growth of political awareness, particularly among many Protestants. In the past they avoided formulating any demands to the Belfast or London authorities in order "not to pour grist in the Catholic mill." From the very beginning the association began to defend the rights of the entire Ulster population regardless of religious community. This is triggering a response. Looking at the first Derry demonstration, Madge Davidson continued, we see that we were able to achieve something. The concept of "one man, one vote" was legalized and property qualifications were abolished. The principle of proportional representation for local elections was introduced. True, many concessions are immediately reduced to naught. A new and more equitable housing allocation system was established. However, so few houses are built that the working people have hardly felt the difference. The "special forces B" were disbanded. However,

they were replaced by the "Ulster Defense Regiment" which is the same bulwark of unionist reaction. The 1922 "emergency law" was repealed; it was replaced by the 1973 "emergency law" and the "terrorism prevention law" which was extended to Northern Ireland in 1976.

For this reason, the association considers now as its main political objective the adoption of a "bill of rights" which would guarantee the following:

Freedom of political views and political activities for all citizens of Northern Ireland;

Ban of all discrimination based on political, religious, or racial characteristics;

Review of complaints against actions by the army and police by an independent authority representing the entire population;

Abrogation of repressive laws.

Such a "bill of rights", the association emphasizes, would put an end to military-police arbitrariness and thus eliminate one of the important reasons for the escalation of the terrorism and violence.

The fighters for civil rights reject acts of terrorism. "We," their leaflet states, "condemn the violence of paramilitary organizations and British security forces, for we consider the right to life the most important of all civil rights. Celebrating the tenth anniversary of the association, we would like to remind you that had our demands been met on time the present vicious circle of violence could have been largely avoided."

A vicious circle...members of Parliament, newspaper columnists, and television commentators argue as to what triggered its beginning and, above all, what would mark its end. Yet, thinking about it, we can see the inertia of eight centuries, and a policy of reacting to the Irish problem only in terms of "measures for bringing order," and repressions. Troops were sent in 1969. This did not help. In August 1971 "internment" was used. This not only heated the situation even further but triggered an international scandal. London found itself on the bench of the accused in Strasbourg.

"Internment", i.e., arbitrary detention and imprisonment of thousands of people in the (Long Kesh) concentration camp without trial or charges, is the most striking embodiment of military-police arbitrariness. The people were not simply detained. In addition to physical torture a new interrogation system based on mental pressure was used. It calls for a lengthy and combined influence on human sensory organs. The person's head is imprisoned in a light-proof hood. Furthermore, special noise irritants are used. The prisoner is not allowed to sleep and is left without water and food. Finally, in order to disturb the vestibular apparatus he is forced to stand in a slanted position with hands leaning against the wall. Such a torture

creates painful hallucinations and syncope, loss of a feeling of time and space, and mental disturbances.

It is noteworthy that Ulster police investigators were given such training at the army training intelligence center in (Meyersfeld) (Sussex County) long before the introduction of the "internment" system. This leads to the assumption that the new interrogation system was developed, along with other ways and means for suppressing the "subversive and rebel movement" on the scale of the entire country and was only tested under the conditions of Ulster as a convenient "experimental" area.

News on the torture leaked by the press triggered a great deal of objections abroad, particularly among the population of the Irish Republic. Under the pressure of public opinion Dublin officially instigated the case against London by submitting a complaint to the European Commission for the Defense of Human Rights, in December 1971.

As a result of investigations which lasted slightly under five years, the commission determined that Great Britain was guilty of violation of Article Three of the European Human Rights Convention which forbids torture and inhuman and degrading treatment of prisoners. It was also established that such methods were used in Ulster not on the initiative of those immediately involved but by the decision of higher authorities.

The open trial of the case of "Ireland versus Great Britain", which opened in February, struck a blow at London's prestige. The trial shed new light on the real state of affairs of the tragic events whose roots could be traced into the centuries.

As early as 1870, in one of his letters, Marx emphasized the need "to awaken in the English working class the awareness that the national liberation of Ireland represents to it not an abstract matter of justice or humanitarianism but a prime condition for its own social liberation" (K. Marx and F. Engels, "Soch.", Volume 32, p 558-559). This statement is topical not only from the moral-political but the strictly practical viewpoint. As Comrade O'Riordan, head of the delegation of the Communist Party of Ireland, noted at the Berlin Conference of Communist and Worker Parties of Europe, "The experience and lessons of the campaign of repressions in Northern Ireland are being studied with a view to their possible application in Britain or against the working people of other countries in capitalist Europe."

Suffice it to walk along the streets of Belfast, see the army patrols slinking along the fences, to be suddenly searched while one parachutist feels you from top to bottom, while another one is pointing his submachine gun at you, while yet another is transmitting by radio the content of your documents, you would realize that the British army is not simply gaining combat experience but mastering, under the new circumstances, the police functions it once performed in the colonies.

In Belfast I was given a pamphlet by a group of progressive scientists. It was entitled "The New Repression Technology--The Lesson of Northern Ireland." "Of late," the authors write, "the role of an experimental field for the British army in developing the theory and practice for the suppression of internal troubles and mutinies was moved from the former colonies to Ireland. The interference of the military in civilian affairs was a widespread phenomenon for centuries in the overseas possessions of the empire. However, it is precisely in Ireland that, for the first time, the British army has to wage this kind of war under the conditions of a developed capitalist country which is, furthermore, a structural part of the United Kingdom."

Democratic public opinion has frequently expressed its concern for the fact that ever greater reliance is placed on operations against the "internal enemy" in troop training. It was precisely in Ulster, stated the Association for the Struggle for Civil Rights, that over 300 technical innovations from the steadily expanded arsenal of repressive measures were tested. This includes the use of dyed water sprayers to "mark" demonstrators; a tear gas solution which makes possible the erection of obstacles made of toxic foam; rubber and plastic "bullets" whose shape and size resemble small gun shells; nylon nets to capture "instigators" in the crowd; electric rods, and other similar means.

In addition to playing the role of training grounds for troops and for testing punitive equipment, London uses Ulster as a laboratory for repressive laws. Under the pretext of fighting terrorism a number of measures have been elaborated which could be used for the suppression of political opposition as well. The law on the prevention of terrorism, which allows the detention of any suspect for seven days, is valid for the entire territory of Great Britain. The beginning of new methods for reprisal through the courts was laid in Ulster: closed trials, and trials without a jury and without the hearing of prosecution witnesses in the presence of the defendant. Having abolished the "internment" practice, the authorities retained their right to renew it at any moment. Finally, we should not ignore the factor of "accustoming" the people to military-police arbitrariness: eventually the people reconcile themselves to the constant encroachments on the inviolability of their person and become accustomed to being searched and to intrusions in their homes.

The present of Ulster may become the future of Great Britain. Army activities in the events of Northern Ireland could become a rehearsal for army actions on a general British scale. The progressive forces have drawn this conclusion and have warned the public of this fact.

After half a century of deliberate promotion of hostility and discord on religious grounds, as was stated at the 34th Congress of the Communist Party of Great Britain, time, patience, and understanding by all sides will be necessary to heal the wounds caused by past and present conflict and remove accumulated fears and suspicions. The people of Northern Ireland, the congress noted, need an atmosphere of normal political stability, free from repressive laws and from fear of internment or daily persecution on the

part of British soldiers, religious murders, and fanatical hatred and obstructions to political activities. The British people and, particularly, the labor movement, are responsible for helping the people of Northern Ireland to acquire such conditions.

In turn, the communists of the north and south of Ireland, as was pointed out at the 16th Congress of the Communist Party of Ireland, also deem it as their main task to struggle for the political and social rights and civic freedoms of the Irish working people, based on the unity of the worker and democratic movements. The participants of the Berlin Conference of Communist and Worker Parties of Europe expressed their solidarity with the struggle waged by the democratic forces of Northern Ireland.

The problem of Northern Ireland--in the local and all-British sense--has become part of the struggle for the defense of human rights and against the continuing mockery of the basic demands of justice.

5003

CSO: 1802

COMPREHENSIVE STUDY OF THE DEVELOPED SOCIALIST ECONOMY

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 5, Mar 77 pp 123-124

[Review by Ye. Kapustin, USSR Academy of Sciences corresponding member, of the book "Sovetskaya Ekonomika na Sovremennom Etape" (The Soviet Economy at the Present Stage) by T. S. Khachaturov. Mysl', Moscow, 1975, 367 pages]

[Text] This book considers within a single complex the most important aspects of the developed socialist economy. It skillfully combines the study of theoretical problems with a substantiation of specific practical suggestions aimed at upgrading social production effectiveness.

The book could be divided into three parts. The first offers a detailed study of the resources for economic growth: population, natural environment, and fixed and working capital. The second described the main factors for upgrading social production effectiveness: scientific and technical progress, higher labor productivity, and improved utilization of raw materials, fuel, materials, and capital assets. Finally, the third section discusses the development of big sectorial blocks: industry, agriculture, transportation, and capital construction.

The author directs the attention to the most topical economic problems of the developed socialist society. One of them is the rates and proportions in the development of the national economy and their influence on production effectiveness. The author does not limit himself to the study of this problem at the contemporary stage but describes the way it was resolved in the course of the entire building of socialism in our country. This enables us to understand its contemporary aspects more profoundly.

An interesting study is given of the dynamics of the share of accumulations in the different development stages of the Soviet economy. The reasons for the changes occurring in the capital-intensiveness of the national income are characterized; a study is made of the trend in the changes of capital returns and factors determining them. In this connection the author analyzes intensive and extensive production development factors in their interaction. This enables him to explain to the reader the basic directions followed in improving national economic planning and management.

With the help of extensive statistical data the author studies the resources for economic growth. He pays particular attention to environmental resources. At present the gross amount of raw materials extracted in the USSR has reached almost five billion tons per year. According to forecasts, by the end of the century their extraction will nearly triple. Having studied statistical data, the author reaches the conclusion that available information on reserves of minerals in the USSR and of timber and land and water resources indicate that in the future as well we shall have at our disposal all basic types of natural resources. Bearing in mind the possibilities created by scientific and technical progress, allowing society the use of new types of raw materials and energy, this conclusion would be unequivocal. However, this does not exclude but, conversely, presumes their rational, thrifty, and careful utilization on the basis of comprehensive national economic planning.

A national economic approach to problems of the effective utilization of the natural resources also means their comprehensive utilization, and the full use of wastes and auxiliary products. Naturally, this requires additional capital investments. Estimates and practical experience have indicated, however, that, as a rule, such investments are rapidly redeemed.

The author notes that upgrading the effectiveness with which natural resources are utilized presumes their evaluation as part of the system of economic estimates. He describes in detail familiar approaches to such assessments and substantiates his suggestions in this field. He has considered in sufficient detail problems of environmental protection as well. Unfortunately, however, he has paid insufficient attention to the development, utilization, and economic assessment of waste-free technology as the most important future trend for the solution of this complex problem.

The monograph deals extensively with scientific and technical progress. T. Khachaturov does not limit himself merely to the formulation of "general" problems but substantiates in a number of cases their basic solution. This applies, in particular, to the determination of scientific effectiveness, and the substantiation and choice of the most expedient directions for its development. In our view, the author has adopted a correct approach to determining the results of applied research established at the time of their utilization on the basis of the computation of the so-called economic potential with maximally possible or limited scales of application.

The author offers a detailed study of ways for lowering the capital-intensiveness of output and, above all, for increasing industrial production capacities mainly through the reconstruction, modernization, and expansion of operating enterprises. The reduction of capital-intensiveness of output also calls for the fuller utilization of capital assets. Elaborating this problem, the author studies that of reserve capacities which is of great importance to the national economy and is still poorly developed. The elaboration of a more profound concept of processes occurring in the socialist economy is assisted by comparisons given by the author with the most developed capitalist country--the United States--covering nearly all indicators.

The book offers a considerable study of the national income as an indicator of economic growth, and its dynamics in the conditions of our country. The author proves that the decline of the share of the national income in the social product is legitimate. It is explained by the fact that the size of the national income is proportional to labor outlays. Yet, in the course of technical progress and the development of production forces the share of material outlays grow. In the future this process will counter to a certain extent the lowering of the cost of capital goods as a result of higher labor productivity. The study of the data indicates, however, that the level of decline of labor outlays is considerably higher than of material outlays. For this reason, in particular, the share of wages in the cost of industrial output has been systematically declining over a number of years.

The quality of this monograph is its comprehensive approach to the study of contemporary economics. Yet, in several cases, this results in an insufficiently profound interpretation of some problems. It seems to us that this has influenced particularly noticeably the interpretation of problems related to the description of the development of socialist production relations and of some social processes. We believe that having thoroughly studied the pace and rates of development of the national economy and its sectorial and technological structure, the author has paid insufficient attention to the development of socialist ownership, distribution, and consumption relations which play an important role in insuring the high and stable rates of development of the Soviet economy.

Quite properly drawing the attention of the readers to the link between the conscious utilization of commodity-monetary relations under socialism, in accordance with their new content, and the planning process, in our view the author has narrowed the problem of their more effective utilization within the system of economic management as a whole. Obviously, therefore, in a number of cases his suggestions have not been concretized. Thus, he speaks of the need for a more effective utilization of credits, long-term in particular, but limits himself to issuing general recommendations only.

The big section discussing the problem of upgrading the living standard of the Soviet people does not include problems of differences between the concepts of "way" and "standard" of life. As the work shows, the author does not ascribe essential significance to these differences.

As a whole, we could say that the party aktiv and the broad circle of readers of economic publications have been given a thorough and interesting work which will enable them to interpret better the socioeconomic processes of the developed socialist society.

5003

CSO: 1802

CONTEMPORARY CAPITALISM AND IDEOLOGICAL STRUGGLE

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 5, Mar 77 pp 125-128

[Review by G. Khromushin, doctor of economic sciences, professor of five books in the series "Contemporary Capitalism and Ideological Struggle"]

[Text] A series of five books¹ has been added to the stock of scientific publications providing a critical study of the basic political and economic concepts of contemporary bourgeois, reformist, and revisionist ideologues. The authors of this fundamental work--written by a collective of scientists from the Institute of World Economics and International Relations, USSR Academy of Sciences, issued by the Mysl' publishing house, have been able, thanks to a comprehensive multiple-level approach, to paint the complex picture of the ideological struggle in the world arena, determine the reasons for shifts in the bourgeois outlook and the new forms of defense of capitalism, and to depict clearly the defensive positions which the supporters of the old world are trying to retain in answer to the offensive launched by socialist theory and practice.²

This study is an important pace in resolving the problems of ideological struggle set at the 25th CPSU Congress, aimed at energetic propaganda work and prompt rebuttal of hostile ideological diversions.

The ideological struggle is developing in various forms. It is manifested in the conflict of different views, ideas, and doctrines. In the final account, however, as is noted in the first book, "two opposite trends could be determined behind all this diversity: the first is the ideological defense and justification of capitalism and attacks on socialism; the second is a substantiation of the need for the revolutionary overthrow of capitalism and the establishment of a new, socialist system throughout the world" (p 6). The profound study of the doctrines, ideas, and concepts of the first direction, and the convincing proof of their theoretical and practical groundlessness constitute the content of all five books.

As a class the contemporary bourgeoisie is quite heterogenous and, consequently, the ideological positions of its various groups are different, even though their basic feature and foundation remains the defense of capitalism

and the rejection of socialism. In the study this important Marxist concept is further concretized. This enables us to realize better the growing depth of contradictions within the bourgeois society. At the same time, the works deal with the social strata in the growing army of hired labor which are included in the contemporary working class, its position in the social structure, production, politics, ideology, and spiritual life of capitalist countries, and its possibility for the implementation of its historical mission--the revolutionary overthrow of capitalist rule. These questions are related to others, including the role of the scientific and technical revolution in social progress.

We read with great interest the book "Ideyno-Politicheskiye Tcheniya Imperializma" [The Ideological-Political Currents of Imperialism], which opens with a chapter on the ideology of the state-monopoly oligarchy. Noting a decline in the proportion of the bourgeoisie itself in the gainfully employed population, and the withering away of the "productive bourgeois", the authors draw the conclusion that the upper capitalist class, whose main part is a stratum owning a considerable share of stocks, could be singled out (see pages 24-25). Considering this phenomenon as a development inherent in the capitalist process of separating capital ownership from operating capital, they raise the question of the fact that the private-monopoly and state-monopoly forms of ownership have brought to life a new capitalist stratum--the high level controllers of this ownership (the managers). The authors include in the ruling stratum of the contemporary bourgeois society, along with managers and owners, the government bureaucracy and the technocratic upper crust, the representatives of the military caste, and the bourgeois ideologues, defenders of monopoly capitalism.

The thesis of the role of managers is not unquestionable. It requires further study. The problem is that the process of separating ownership capital from operational capital has brought about the elimination of capitalists who combine within themselves the owner and the manager of the enterprise, shifting management functions, to an even greater extent to the managers. However, the managerial stratum is not homogeneous, and the affiliation of its higher groups with the state-monopoly oligarchy is determined not only by great factual power and stable position, as is pointed out in the work, but by the ownership of a considerable share of the stock. The various managerial strata are distinguished above all by this share of ownership and, after that, by their position within the production system. This determines their differences in terms of the ways and means used in strengthening the structure of monopoly capitalism. Furthermore, the managers quite frequently find themselves unemployed, sharing the fate of millions of unfortunate working people.

The basic feature of contemporary bourgeois economic theories is the acknowledgement of the increased concentration of capital, and the loss of a free market based on the law of supply and demand in its old interpretation. However, their interpretation of this fact, long known to the Marxists, is based on apologetic positions which deny the intensification of antagonistic contradictions in the world of private ownership.

Together with the increased concentration of capital they acknowledge the intensification of state interference in the economy. However, they reject the process of the merger of the forces of the state with those of the monopolies which frequently result in the intensified exploitation and lack of rights of the working people. Emphasizing this aspect, the authors draw the conclusion of the growth of monopoly capitalism into state-monopoly capitalism and the conversion of the state into part of the economic base (see page 29). It seems to us that this conclusion has not been given the necessary backing, for the claim that the state has become part of the economic base erroneously confuses the emphasis in the question of the correlation between the base and the superstructure.

The main purpose of the various bourgeois concepts in defending contemporary capitalism is the refutation of the Marxist doctrine of the classes and the class struggle. The working class is the bulk of the army of hired labor. Its role in social production and in social and political processes is growing steadily. This is triggering new attempts on the part of bourgeois ideologues to subordinate it to their influence. This is the purpose of the theories of "deproletarianization" of the bourgeois society, the "self-elimination" of the working class, its integration in the "industrial society", the disappearance of reasons triggering revolutionary feelings, and so on. The criticism of these theories runs through the entire five books in the series, acquiring a concentrated expression in the work "Sovremennyy Kapitalizm i Rabochiy Klass: Kritika Antimarksistskikh Kontseptsii" [Contemporary Capitalism and the Working Class: Critique of Anti-Marxist Concepts].

The definition of the proletariat as a class consisting exclusively of industrial workers or workers engaged in physical labor in the various economic sectors is the basis of the bourgeois concepts (see page 33). This "definition" leads to the conclusion of the "erosion" of the working class by virtue of the allegedly reduced need for "blue collars" under the influence of the scientific and technical revolution, as well as the result of the transition of the workers to the ranks of the "middle class".

The bourgeois-reformists definitions of the proletariat as a class are countered by the authors of this series with a Marxist-Leninist analysis of the structure of the contemporary working class. Indeed, the scientific and technical revolution had a profound influence on it, having changed the ratio among skilled, semi-skilled, and unskilled industrial proletariat. The share of the skilled manpower is growing steadily while that of workers engaged in physical labor is declining. However, the decline of the share of physical labor does not take place in the least at the rate imagined by the bourgeois ideologues and in terms of absolute figures the number of workers performing physical labor is even growing (from 10.4 million people in 1900 to 29 million in 1972--see page 34).

Consequently, attempts to lower the role of physical labor are groundless. The desire to reduce the question of the structure of the working class to that of the dynamics of the share of physical labor in order to prove the

"erroneousness" of the Marxist theory of the increased size of the proletariat with the development of capitalism represents an open falsification of Marxism. Marx did not restrict in the least the ranks of the working class to workers engaged in physical labor. Higher skills of considerable detachments of the industrial proletariat do not change their position as hired labor deprived of ownership of capital goods, selling their manpower and remaining the object of capitalist exploitation.

Along with the industrial proletariat the authors of the study include within the contemporary working class the commercial workers, many groups of office workers (see pages 35-36), as well as technical specialists engaged in productive work, as well as the lower group of employees (see "Ideyno-Politicheskiye Tcheniya Imperializma", pp 54-55). They justifiably caution against the absolutization of any or even several acknowledgements, noting that the contemporary working class is a far more complex and rapidly developing social community compared with the proletariat of the 19th Century. A study of the structure of the working class convincingly exposes the myth of the "deproletarianization" of the contemporary capitalist society. Yet, this does not exhaust in the least this complex problem. Thus, the problem of including in the ranks of the working class trade and office workers requires clarifications, for Marx pointed out not only the similarity between a trade worker and all other hired workers, but the substantial differences in them as well.

The work considerably intensifies a number of aspects of the Marxist criticism of the bourgeois-reformist theories of the "middle class" and the "new working class". In this respect, the critical analysis of the bourgeois theories of alienation which constitute an important aspect of the concepts of the "industrial" and "post industrial society" is quite interesting. Absolutizing the socioeconomic processes occurring under the influence of the scientific and technical revolution and, particularly, the division between ownership capital and capital as a function, the creators of such concepts pit the economic exploration of roots of alienation, represented by capitalist ownership, against the so-called social mechanism of the scientific and technical revolution, as though pitting the past against the future. Rejecting the role of capitalist ownership, and proclaiming it as fiction, the theoreticians of "post-industrialism" proclaim the "obsolescence" of the class struggle and the automatic elimination of the alienation of hired workers from the activities of the meritocracy, i.e., the rule by the professionally worthy managers. On the social level the solution of the problem of economic alienation is linked with upgrading skills of hired labor. Allegedly, this process leads to changes in the position of the working class in the structure of society, and the weakening of the results of alienation such as unemployment, low skills and wages, and social obstructions on the path to education and cultural values.

In the 1960's bourgeois and revisionist theoreticians such as E. Fischer, R. Garaudy, S. Malle, H. Marcuse, and others, formulated the concept of the "new working class". Even though on the surface it opposed the theory

of "deproletarianization", its objectives were the same: to refute the Marxist concept of the vanguard role of the working class in the revolutionary struggle, and to reassess the question of the allies of the working class, the intelligentsia in particular. The intelligentsia was proclaimed the leading detachment of the working class, while the role of the latter was reduced to zero. Such elaborations confuse various criteria: the increased role of science and progressive technology, the strategic position of leading sectors in the economy, on the one hand, and the role of a given class within the system of capitalist production relations, on the other. The former is proclaimed as the decisive characteristic of the "new working class", while the latter is ignored. The purpose of the different variations on this theme, as the study proves, is to "separate" from a leading role in the revolutionary process the bulk of the contemporary proletariat and replace it with a fabricated conglomerate of socio-professional groups holding different positions within the contemporary capitalist structure (see page 236).

Noteworthy among the large number of ideological problems considered is the study of the theory of the "post-industrial society". The bourgeois theoreticians, D. Bell in particular, classify the conversion from an economy of processing sectors to an economy of services, and to the growing predominance of the "class of specialists and technicians", and the leading role of theoretical knowledge as the foundation for new developments and political formulations as the characteristics of this society, distinguishing it from the preceding industrial mass production and consumption stage (see "Kritika Burzhuzaznykh Kontseptsii Nauchno-Tekhnicheskoy Revolyutsii" [Critique of the Bourgeois Concepts of the Scientific and Technical Revolution], page 49). In other words, here a decisive significance is ascribed to the realm of services and to its prevalence over material output. According to the authors of this concept, the conversion to the dominating position of services eliminates the deformation of the personality inherent in industrialism, changes the nature of the social structure, and levels off social contradictions. The theoretical groundlessness of this emphasis is based on a rejection of the objective laws governing social development.

The extensive dissemination of the theory of the "post-industrial society" in the 1970's is linked with the developed economic crisis, growth of unemployment, and failure of the illusions of a "society of abundance". The entire meaning of these theorists is that their supporters, by virtue of the aggravation of capitalist contradictions, were forced to abandon their blind faith in technological imperatives which, allegedly, automatically transform capitalism. Since technology was unable to eliminate antagonisms within the bourgeois society, the solution of problems related to the building of the class struggle is entrusted, as in the past, to lame reforms which, in themselves, naturally, could hardly yield anything.

The books under review offer an extensive study of the ideology of reformism and revisionism. This is natural in a Marxist study of contemporary ideological problems, for, as Lenin taught, "the struggle with imperialism,

unless inseparably linked with the struggle against opportunism, is a meaningless and false phrase" ("Poln. Sobr. Soch." [Complete Collected Works], Volume 27, page 424). Here the criticism is subordinated to the task of increasing the awareness of the working class and is a necessary prerequisite in the struggle for its revolutionary unity.

The monograph provides an expanded answer to the question of why the ideological rapprochement between scientific communism and the reformism of the social democrats is impossible, as well as that of the possible fields for joint political action.

The study indicates that in the entire range of basic ideological and theoretical contemporary problems the positions of reformism are most tightly interwoven with those of the bourgeois theoreticians. It is also clear that the ideological and political positions of the social democratic leaders are encountering the growing resistance of the parties and trade unions, and that the common class interest of the working people and the objective requirements of the class struggle against the forces of reaction and imperialism are assuming a decisive importance in insuring cooperation between communists and socialists.

The monograph offers a detailed study of the ideology of "left-wing" extremism in its entire variety ranging from the "new left" to the "urban guerrillas". Despite the shadings, the authors emphasize, this ideology shares a number of common features and a common social base--nonproletarian and proletarian-satellite strata, a conceptual system--a rebellious-critical attitude toward contemporary capitalism, the acknowledgement of the same spiritual values, and, above all, neglect of the basic contradiction of our epoch--contradiction between socialism and capitalism, as well as an attack against the communist parties.

The authors conclude their critical study of the ideology of opportunism by exposing the origins, nature, and characteristics of contemporary revisionism. "Revisionism," they point out, "is an ideological-political current directed precisely against the higher forms of the class organization of the proletariat. Under contemporary conditions revisionism is a current acting or trying to act against the Marxist-Leninist principles on which the communist movement is based ("Ideyno-Politicheskiye Tseniye Imperializma", page 176).

Bourgeois nationalism is singled out in particular among the currents hostile to scientific communism and the theory and practice of proletarian internationalism. Imperialism is using it ever more energetically with a view to dividing the labor movement within the individual countries and on a universal scale, against the international communist movement, and against the unification of all revolutionary forces of our time. The series under review exposes the nature of nationalism and its forms and characteristics in a number of capitalist and developing countries. It offers a detailed study of an extremely dangerous form of nationalism such as racism, including Zionism, which is a tool of imperialist reaction.

The work written by this collective of scientists from the USSR Academy of Sciences Institute of World Economics and International Relations is a major contribution to the struggle against bourgeois, reformist, and revisionist ideology. Naturally, not all theoretical problems have been fully resolved in this work. Some of the views are controversial and call for further intensified arguments. The very formulation of controversial problems, however, is unquestionably positive if we recall that the development of Marxist-Leninist theory is an uninterrupted, dialectically complex, and creative process. All of contemporary reality proves the profound substantiation of the conclusion of the 25th CPSU Congress to the effect that today the need for the further creative development of theory is increasing rather than decreasing.

FOOTNOTES

1. Editor in chief of the "Contemporary Capitalism and Ideological Struggle" series Doctor of Economic Sciences V. Ya. Aboltin; editors: Doctor of Historical Sciences G. G. Diligenskiy; A. G. Mileykovskiy, USSR Academy of Sciences corresponding member; and Doctor of Economic Sciences V. A. Cheprakov.

"Ideyno-Politicheskiye Tcheniya Imperializma", Moscow, 1975, 317 pages.

G. S. Sogomonyan, "Apologeticheskiye Kontseptsii Sotsial-Reformizma" [Apologetic Concepts of Social Reformism], Moscow, 1975, 371 pages.

"Kritika Burzhuaznykh Kontseptsiiy Nauchno-Tekhnicheskoy Revolyutsii", Moscow, 1976, 271 pages.

"Kritika Burzhuaznykh Teoriy Natsionalizma i Rasizma" [Critique of the Bourgeois Theories of Nationalism and Racism], Moscow, 1976, 287 pages.

"Sovremennyy Kapitalizm i Rabochiy Klass: Kritika Antimarksistskikh Kontseptsiiy", Moscow, 1976, 260 pages.

2. For more details on such matters as applicable to the United States against a vast historical background see the book by A. V. Valyuzhenich "Amerikanskiy Liberalizm: Ilyuzii i Real'nosti" [American Liberalism: Illusions and Realities], Nauka, Moscow, 1976, 343 pages.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatel'stvo PRAVDA, KOMMUNIST, 1977

5003

CSO: 1802

- END -